9th WORLD CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY

WCRI 2026

May 3 - 6, 2026 | Vancouver, BC, Canada

9th World Conference on Research Integrity
May 3 - 6, 2026 | Vancouver, BC, Canada

Abstract Book



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORAL PRESENTATIONS 4

Oral Session 1.C 4

Oral Session 1.D 9

Oral Session 1.E 14

Oral Session 1.F 19

Oral Session 1.G 24

Oral Session 2.D 30

Oral Session 2.E 36

Oral Session 2.F 42

Oral Session 2.G 48

Oral Session 3.B 54

Oral Session 3.C 59

Oral Session 3.D 65

Oral Session 3.E 71

Oral Session 3.F 77

Oral Session 3.G 82

Oral Session 4.C 88

Oral Session 4.D 94

Oral Session 4.E 100

Oral Session 4.F 106

Oral Session 4.G 112

Oral Session 5.B 118

Oral Session 5.C 123

Oral Session 5.D 129

Oral Session 5.E 135

Oral Session 5.F 141

Oral Session 5.G 147

Oral Session 6.B 153

Oral Session 6.C 158

Oral Session 6.D 164

Oral Session 6.E 170

Oral Session 6.F 176

Oral Session 6.G 182
Oral Session 7.B 187
Oral Session 7.C 193
Oral Session 7.D 199
Oral Session 7.E 204
Oral Session 7.F 209
Oral Session 7.G 214

POSTER PRESENTATIONS 220
May 4 – Poster Listing 220
May 5 – Poster Listing 301

ORAL PRESENTATIONS

1.C - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Examining Support for Reproducibility at Funders, Journals, and Research Institutions using TOP2025

Dr. Nicholas DeVito[1], *Constant Vinatier*[3], *Ms. Ayu Putu Madri Dewi*[2], *Stefan Wouters*[4], *Dr. Florian Naudet*[3,5], *Dr. Inge Stegeman*[4,6], *Veerle Van den Eynden*[7]

[1]University Of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom, [2]Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [3]Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) - UMR_S 1085, F-35000, Rennes, France, [4]Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head & Neck Surgery University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands, [5]Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France, [6]Brain Center, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands, [7]Research Data Management Competence Centre, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

Objective
The Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Factors were created to assess open science practices at journals. Revisions to these criteria (TOP 2025) aimed, in part, to make them “relevant to organizations in the scholarly community other than journals.” Using these revised criteria, we assessed how European research, and research-adjacent, institutions address and promote reproducibility.

Method
We included the top 20 journals by published Horizon 2020 outputs; the largest research funders in each EU member state, the UK and the European Commission (n=29); and the top 20 academic institutions by Horizon 2020-funded projects (limit two institutions per country). Institutional websites were searched for documentation or resources relevant to TOP 2025 criteria. Assessments were carried out independently and in duplicate with differences resolved by consensus. Findings are currently being shared with institutions for feedback before finalisation.

Results
Full results of this project will be presented at the meeting. Preliminary findings, prior to stakeholder outreach, show that across examined organisations, TOP 2025 criteria are largely not promoted, supported, or recognised via policy or practice. Data sharing is the most frequently required or supported research practice across all organisation types. Lesser, but notable, engagement with material and code sharing was seen. Certain requirements are often limited to specific types of studies, such as clinical trials. Ensuring independent verification of research practices (i.e. TOP Level 3) or resourcing independent checks on reporting accuracy or computational reproducibility is essentially non-existent within our study sample for any organisations. Additionally, outside of some modest support for replication studies and registered reports, the verification studies highlighted by TOP 2025 are rarely mentioned.

Conclusion
There is a need for increased investment in evidence generation around the value of transparency and openness practices towards goals such as reproducibility as well as concerted efforts around cross-disciplinary adoption. Additional action, beyond endorsement of scientific reform elements, need to be coordinated across major stakeholder groups to advance the art in this area.

Funded by Horizon Europe grant agreement No. 101094725. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the EU or ERA.

Researchers' Attitudes Towards the EQIPD Quality System, and Its Impact on Research Climate, Best Practices, and Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Mr. Björn Gerlach[1,2,3], *Dr. Stephanie Zellers*[4], *Rachel Heyard*[5], *Andreas Scherer*[4], *Emily Sena*[6], *Dr. Kimberley Wever*[7]

[1]*Guarantors of EQIPD e.V., Heidelberg, Germany,* [2]*Central Institute of Mental Healther, Mannheim, Germany,* [3]*PAASP GmbH, Heidelberg, Germany,* [4]*Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland FIMM, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland,* [5]*Center for Reproducible Science and Research Synthesis, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland,* [6]*Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom,* [7]*Radboud university medical center, Department of Anaesthesiology, Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

Objective

Efforts to improve reproducibility in biomedical research have led to the development of research Quality Systems, such as the EQIPD QS (Enhancing Quality in Preclinical Research). While these aim to promote best practices (e.g., the FAIR data principles), their impact on research climate and culture is less understood. This mixed method study (part of the Horizon Europe-funded iRISE project) investigates the effect of EQIPD QS implementation on research climate, best practice use, and equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) in biomedical research units.

Methods

We conducted a preregistered global online survey based on the Survey of Organizational Research Climate (SORC), with additional questions on research environment, attitudes towards quality systems, and EDI aspects. The survey ran from September 2024 to January 2025 and received 212 responses from researchers from various disciplines and career stages. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, free-text responses were thematically analysed.

Results

SORC and research environment scales showed moderate to high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.65–0.92$). All scales were positively correlated ($r = 0.37–0.68$), suggesting coherence in how individuals perceive different aspects of research culture. Respondents who reported workplace discrimination in the past year had lower scores across all scales ($p < 0.001$). A large majority of respondents recognized the value of systematic approaches to research quality: 39% saw clear benefits of a quality system, 46% were open to the idea, and only 15% believed it might not benefit academic research. Open-text responses indicated that participants associate quality systems with improved reproducibility (15%), higher research quality (10%), and a common understanding of best practices (8%). Overall, the responses indicate that quality systems could positively influence both lab environments and the broader research landscape. Barriers reported included time, funding, and administrative burden.

Conclusion

These findings offer a global snapshot of research climate and readiness for quality system implementation. Several research units have now implemented the EQIPD QS, and post-implementation surveys are ongoing. Analyses comparing the global and post-implementation data will be presented at the conference. Our findings suggest that quality systems show promise for supporting a stronger culture of integrity, reproducibility, and inclusive research practice.

The Brazilian Reproducibility Network

Dr. Eduarda Centeno[1,2], *Dr. Clarissa Carneiro*[1,2], *Dr Carmen Penido*[1,3], *Dr. Roberta Andrejew*[1,7], *Dr. Ricardo Ceneviva*[1,5], *Dr. Renato Santos*[1,4], *Dr. Raquel Freitag*[1,6], *Prof. Olavo Amaral*[1,2]
[1]Brazilian Reproducibility Network, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, [2]Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, [3]Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, [4]University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, [5]Federal University of ABC, Santo André, Brazil, [6]Federal University of Sergipe, São Cristóvão, Brazil, [7]University of Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France

The global scientific paradigm is changing toward more open, inclusive, transparent and reproducible practices. These are values increasingly endorsed by several national governments and organisations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Yet, bringing scientists on board is not a trivial effort. Time and resources are often limited in academia, especially in countries from the Global South. Initiatives that promote change and guide the scientific community through this paradigm shift are therefore essential. In Brazil, two years ago, we launched the Brazilian Reproducibility Network (BrRN), which seeks to consolidate the discussion about open and reproducible practices at a national level and beyond. With the support of our two funders (Serrapilheira Institute and José Luiz Setúbal Foundation), we develop educational resources, publish tailored recommendations, fund metascience projects, cultivate a network of ambassadors across the country, and engage with a diverse range of research-related stakeholders — from individual researchers to government agencies. At the time of this submission, our community includes 100 members across 18 of Brazil's 26 states, spanning six institutions, 19 groups, seven scientific societies, six journals, 38 ambassadors, and four individual members. We currently support nine metascience projects, are developing an online course to be launched next year, and are actively contributing to the 6th National Action Plan linked to the Open Government Partnership (a multilateral initiative promoting open government and transparency in governance). The BrRN is seen as an example of success within the Global Federation of RNs and has contributed to the increased adoption of reproducible practices, institutional changes, and greater awareness of research integrity in Brazil.

We look forward to sharing our journey, achievements, and future goals on improving research rigour in the Global South with the WCRI community.

Navigating the Role of Generative Artificial Intelligence Chatbots in the Medical Research and Publishing Process: Perspectives from Researchers, Peer Reviewers, Publishers, and Editors-in-Chief

*Ms. Magdalene Abebe[1,2], Ms. Wid Al-Zahraa Al-Khafaji[1,2], Mr. Daivat Bhavsar[1,2], Ms. Malvika Krishnamurthy[1,2], Ms. Jyot Adhvaryu[1,2], Mr. Vetrivel Balaji[3], Ms. Gursimran Deol[1,2], Ms. Neha Dhanvanthry[1,2], Ms. Laura Duffy[1,2], Mr. Hamin Jo[1,2], Mr. Tejas Karrthik[1,2], Ms. Amy Aoxin Li[1,2], Ms. Sharleen Maduranayagam[1,2], Ms. Pranavee Mohanakanthan[1,2], Ms. Nirekah Suthakar[1,2], Ms. Adharva Vellaparambil[1,2], Prof Lex Bouter[4,5], Dr. Teresa Chan[6], Dr. Holger Cramer[1,2], Ms. Annette Flanagin[7], Dr. R. Brian Haynes[8], Dr. Alfonso Iorio[8,9], Cynthia Lokker[8], Prof Hervé Maisonneuve[10,11], Prof. Ana Marušić[12], Prof David Moher[13,14,15], **Dr. Jeremy Y Ng**[1,2,8,13,16]*

[1]Institute of General Practice and Interprofessional Care, University Hospital Tubingen, Tübingen, Germany, [2]Robert Bosch Center for Integrative Medicine and Health, Bosch Health Campus, Stuttgart, Germany, [3]Department of Computing and Software, Faculty of Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada, [4]Department of Epidemiology and Health Science, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, Netherlands, [5]Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands, [6]School of Medicine, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, Canada, [7]JAMA and the JAMA Network, Chicago, USA, [8]Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada, [9]Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada, [10]Consultant, Lyon, France, [11]Scientific Committee, Institute of Research and Action on Fraud and Plagiarism in Academia (IRAFPA), Geneva, Switzerland, [12]Department of Research in Biomedicine and Health and Center for Evidence-based Medicine, University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia, [13]Centre for Journalology, Ottawa Methods Centre, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada, [14]School of Epidemiology and Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada, [15]Institute of Health Policy, Management & Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, [16]School of Public Health, Faculty of Health, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Objective
The integration of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) chatbots into medical research and scholarly publishing presents opportunities and challenges to research integrity. Across four cross-sectional studies, we investigated the current landscape of perspectives on GenAI chatbot use.

Method
Three surveys assessed GenAI chatbot use across different aspects of the medical research and scholarly publishing lifecycle: researchers' familiarity and reliance, peer reviewers' (PRs) attitudes toward review, and editors-in-chiefs' (EICs) perceptions in scholarly publishing. An audit of the International Association of Scientific, Technical, and Medical Publishers (STM) examined publicly available policies on the author use of GenAI chatbots in December 2023.

Results
Researchers (n=2165) showed substantial interest in GenAI chatbots, with many using them for writing manuscripts (471/896, 52.6%) and administrative tasks (378/894, 42.3%). While many reported that AI chatbots will be integral in future research (1676/2050, 81.8%), concerns regarding transparency, misinformation, and lack of institutional training (244/2137, 11.4%) and policies (211/2131, 9.9%) were expressed. PRs (n=1260) and EiCs (n=439) recognized the potential of GenAI chatbots to enhance efficiency in tasks such as language editing (EiCs: 308/435, 70.8%; PRs: 652/1013, 64.4%); however, they shared researchers' concerns about ethical implications (345/428, 80.6%; 758/987, 76.8%), and accuracy. Most PRs (744/1058, 70.3%) and EiCs (401/479, 83.7%) had not used GenAI chatbots in editorial work and cited the need for formal training as a main barrier (EiCs: 360/429, 83.9%; PRs: 777/986, 78.8%). Publishers (n=162) are slower to respond; only one-third (56/162, 34.6%) of STM members had a public policy on GenAI chatbot use, with a minority completely prohibiting use among authors (4/56, 7.1%). Existing policies consistently prohibited authorship by GenAI chatbots (51/56, 91.1%) and mandated disclosure (46/56, 82.1%), encouraging author accountability.

Conclusion
Collectively, researchers, PRs, EiCs, and publishers acknowledge the potential of GenAI chatbots in accelerating aspects of the medical research and the scholarly publishing processes, however, considerable research integrity-related concerns remain. Collectively, these four studies highlight an urgent need for the development of guidelines and comprehensive training aimed at multiple stakeholders across the medical research and scholarly publishing lifecycle to guide the responsible integration of GenAI chatbots throughout all stages of these processes.

Canadian Guidance on Research with First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples

Ms. Margaret Blakeney[1], *Ms. Karen Wallace*
[1]*Secretariat On Responsible Conduct of Research, Ottawa, Canada*

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) are jointly responsible for two policies – the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR Framework) and the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS).

TCPS includes Chapter 9: Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Peoples of Canada which is intended to serve as a framework for the ethical conduct of research involving Indigenous peoples. When it was released in 2010, Chapter 9 was acknowledged as "a step toward establishing an ethical space for dialogue on common interests and points of difference between researchers and Indigenous communities engaged in research." The chapter enshrined in policy some principles that had been already widely accepted as important to the conduct of ethical research with Indigenous peoples. These included but were not limited to:

- Engaging with the relevant communities when the research was likely to affect their welfare;
- Recognizing diverse interests within communities;
- Becoming informed about and respecting the relevant community customs and codes of research practice;
- Setting out terms and undertakings in a research agreement, whether formal or informal, before commencing the research;
- Ensuring mutual benefit, reciprocity, and capacity building in research; and
- Ensuring that the community has a role in interpreting research results before dissemination.

Since 2010, the landscape of research involving First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples in Canada has evolved in response to researcher and community experience, to new international guidance (e.g., UNDRIP) and to the findings and Calls to Action of Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).

Accordingly, the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research (SRCR) has begun an initiative to update Chapter 9 and include some relevant complementary guidance within the RCR Framework. This presentation will discuss the progress of the initiative to date including the community engagement process that will support the development of an updated Chapter 9.

Estimating the Predictability of Questionable Journals: Signals and Interpretation

Dr. Daniel Acuna[1,2], *Dr. Han Zhuang*[1]
[1]*University Of Colorado At Boulder, Boulder, USA,* [2]*ReviewerZero AI, Inc, Broomfield, USA*

Objective
The objective of this project is to estimate the extent to which questionable journals are present in the scientific literature. We present the results of an AI system that flags across open-access and preliminarily extend it to hybrid and subscription models. We operationalize several criteria, such as DOAJ, Clarivate delisted journals, and the Chinese Academy of Science's Early Warning System. We create interpretable predictions that can help estimate the extent of the problem, including the geographical regions, funders, and growth of the system.

Method
We extract multiple signals from the website (policies, editorial board), website design features (HTML structure, screenshots), and bibliometrics (author/institution/journal level indicators). We use and compare several supervised models to estimate their performance, employing the Precision and Recall Curve (PRC) for this purpose. We use human reviewers to assess how well the predictions agree with the AI and where the errors occur.

Results
In the open-access setting, the individual models based on website content, website design, and bibliometrics research have PRC-ACU values of 0.35, 0.58, and 0.65, respectively. A model that contains all features obtains a score of 0.79. We estimate the precision at around 76%. We examined our predictions on 15,191 journals that had never been analyzed before and found 1,437 titles that could be problematic. A manual examination of 200 random samples confirmed the precision to be between 0.74 and 0.80. A qualitative estimation revealed that false positives typically involved discontinued titles, book series misindexed as journals, and small society outlets. Feature analyses indicate that high self-citation, lower author h-index, and reduced institutional diversity in references strongly predict questionable venues.

Extending the previous results, we analyze journals beyond open access. Such predictions are much difficult given the sparsity of the data. Preliminary analysis shows that the precision-recall tradeoff remains stable.

Conclusion
We suggest that AI triage will be crucial to keep pace with questionable venues. Our findings indicate that AI can serve as an effective complementary tool that will improve over time. Our next steps involve continuing to update the features of the journals to enhance predictions and interpretations.

Opening Pandora's Box: Paper Mills in Conference Proceedings

Dr. Anna Abalkina[1], *Dr. Marie Kunešová*[2], *Yagmur Ozturk*[3], *Dr. Solal Pirelli*[4]
[1]*Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany,* [2]*University of West Bohemia in Pilsen, Pilsen, Czechia,* [3]*Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LIG, Grenoble, France,* [4]*École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland*

Objective
Paper mills violate research integrity in science, yet knowledge on them remains fragmented and little is known about paper mills in scientific conferences. Previous work has shown that conferences published by the IEEE are particularly at risk. We study paper mills in conferences and analyze publication anomalies and patterns.

Methods
We identified over 200 social media channels that (re)posted offers of authorship for sale in conferences published by the IEEE. Since 07.2025 we collected over 3500 unique paper titles posted between 02.2021-09.2025 together with posting dates and, where possible, numbers of co-authorships for sale. We searched for matching titles in conference proceedings published after the offers' date. Finally, we used Scopus and Crossref to analyze the identified papers and venues.

Results
We identified 1,004 papers in conference proceedings published by the IEEE and indexed in Scopus that are associated with titles in authorship for sale offers. These papers are co-authored by over 3,800 researchers from over 2,000 affiliations in 41 countries, predominantly from India (93% of papers), the USA (13%), and Iraq (9%). The identified papers appeared in 160 IEEE-published conferences, reaching up to 22% in one conference.
Such papers show collaboration anomalies. First, 83% of papers have exactly six co-authors, compared to 16% for all conference papers published by the IEEE in 2024. Since 2020, the number of IEEE-published conferences with mostly six-author papers has increased unlike other author counts, suggesting paper mills successfully infiltrated many such conferences. Second, the papers have five affiliations per paper on average, which is typical for paper-mill publications. Third, 38% of papers include authors from at least two countries, suggesting paper mills operate internationally.
We also identified 57 papers linked to authorship offers in AIP, Taylor&Francis and EDP conferences.

Conclusions
Our study showed the infiltration of paper mills in IEEE-published conferences. The overall number of paper-mill papers may be higher due to limitations of our study: offers by paper mills are often deleted, titles are often changed before publication which makes detection difficult, not all paper mills list titles in their public offers, and not all social media channels have been identified.

The Complementary Role of the Law in Research Misconduct Investigations: Towards Structural Reinforcement?

Dr. Kritika Sharma[1]
[1]*Luxembourg Agency for Research Integrity, Luxembourg*

Research integrity and ethics often raise questions pertaining to the law. These range from general administrative legal considerations to specific areas of the law such as the regulation and protection of data and intellectual property. It is thus unsurprising that the subject of research misconduct and how this is dealt with, similarly raises such questions, along with some others pertaining to the law. One example is the interrelation of labor law and such procedures, particularly in instances where such procedures (research misconduct investigations) find their basis in contractual obligations and often result in labor law related implications.

Acknowledging that the role of the law is often misunderstood by, unclear to, and/or is inaccessible by some if not several parties involved in such procedures, this presentation argues in favor of greater sensitization of the complementary role of the law in dealing with research misconduct. This approach advocates towards utilizing prevalent legal provisions to reinforce non-legal or quasi-legal procedures that are currently in place in several jurisdictions to deal with research misconduct. For this purpose, the presentation looks at various points of cohesion between the law and (most) research misconduct investigative procedures, based on different stages of such investigations. This includes the initiation of proceedings and preliminary examinations; the investigative phase which includes cooperation with such proceedings and the institution of parallel legal proceedings where necessary; and finally, the implementation stage which could include recommendations with direct or indirect legal consequences.

This presentation thus draws from international institutional law, administrative law and labor law to propose structural mechanisms that could reinforce non-legal or quasi-legal investigations of research misconduct. These include for instance: incorporating trigger mechanisms to initiate parallel legal proceedings; incorporating contractual obligations to cooperate through staff codes of conduct and implement recommendations; relying on the evidentiary value of investigation reports to document legal violations; and finally, enhancing knowledge and clarity on the scope as well as limits of the law in dealing with such matters.

This presentation builds on a presentation made by the author at the 2025 ENRIO Congress in Ljubljana and takes into consideration feedback received by the author.

Research Security Trend Analysis: Results from the First Three Years of the National Security Guidelines for Research Partnerships

Mr. Lucas Tersigni[1]
[1]*Public Safety Canada, Ottawa, Canada*

Throughout the last five years, it has become increasingly clear that research in cutting edge and dual-use areas has become a valuable commodity for countries looking to exert both economic and military power. This reality has necessitated a series of policies across several highly developed countries that are designed to protect their valuable research and intellectual property from cooption by other countries.
One of these new policies, the National Security Guidelines for Research Partnerships, has required researchers to fill out a Risk Assessment Form develop a risk mitigation plan when working with private sector partners to consider and mitigate the risks to their research resulting from the partnership. Some of the applications that the granting agencies receive are sent to the Research Security Centre at Public Safety Canada to coordinate a national security risk assessment and determine whether the risks relating to certain partnerships can or cannot be mitigated.
After having conducted national security reviews on more than 100 grant applications since 2022, the Research Security Centre has developed a trend analysis that shows what the most common risk factors are, what causes an application to have unmitigable risk, and what the best mitigation plans look like. This presentation will present the findings of the trend analysis, showing the research community the most common risk vectors and share the best practices to create a strong mitigation plan. It will also delve into how national security experts at the Research Security Centre examine and determine risks and whether risks can or cannot be mitigated.

Guarding Truth or Guarding Secrets? Navigating the Fault Lines Between Research Integrity and Security

Dr. Tayewo Adewumi[1]
[1]*Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin, Nigeria*

Objective
This research aims to critically examine the ethical and policy tensions between research integrity and research security, exploring how transparency, openness, and academic freedom intersect with national interests and protective measures. It seeks to propose balanced frameworks that uphold scientific ethics while addressing legitimate security concerns.

Methods
This research employs critical analysis of scholarly literature, policy documents, and case studies to explore the intersection of research integrity and security. It synthesizes ethical frameworks, institutional guidelines, and global discourse to identify tensions, assess implications, and propose balanced strategies for safeguarding both scientific openness and national interests.

Results
The research reveals a complex and evolving tension between the principles of research integrity such as transparency, openness, and accountability and the imperatives of research security, which prioritize protection of sensitive data, intellectual property, and national interests. Through critical analysis of policy documents, ethical frameworks, and global case studies, it becomes evident that efforts to safeguard research from misuse or foreign interference often conflict with the foundational values of academic freedom and open science. Institutions and governments are increasingly implementing restrictive measures, including data access limitations, publication controls, and enhanced vetting of international collaborations. While these actions aim to mitigate risks, they can inadvertently foster mistrust, hinder interdisciplinary cooperation, and suppress innovation. Researchers face ethical dilemmas, such as balancing openness with confidentiality, navigating dual-use concerns, and complying with security protocols that may compromise scientific transparency. The study highlights the urgent need for balanced frameworks that harmonize integrity and security. It advocates for inclusive policy development, cross-sector dialogue, and culturally sensitive approaches that respect both ethical obligations and legitimate protective concerns. Finally, the findings underscore that safeguarding science requires not only vigilance but also trust, collaboration, and a shared commitment to responsible knowledge creation in a globally interconnected research environment.

Conclusion
This research concludes that reconciling research integrity with security demands refined, context-sensitive approaches. Ethical transparency must not be sacrificed for protection, nor should openness ignore legitimate risks. A balanced framework grounded in trust, dialogue, and policy innovation is essential to safeguard both scientific freedom and the responsible stewardship of knowledge.

1.E - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Embedding the AI Assessment Scale as an Integrity Mechanism: Faculty Experiences Across Two Universities

Dr. Mike Perkins[1], *Mr. Darius Postma, Dr. Jasper Roe, Dr. Susan Sisay, Mr. Craig Holdcroft*
[1]*British University Vietnam, Vietnam*

Objective
To understand how the AI Assessment Scale (AIAS) and other GenAI ethics frameworks enables faculty to integrate GenAI while upholding research-integrity principles of transparency, attribution, auditability, fairness, and proportionate verification; to identify institutional and individual enablers/barriers to AIAS uptake; and to determine which training and supports best build confidence and Critical AI Literacy (CAIL) for integrity-aligned adoption.

Methods
Five faculty focus groups (N=30) were conducted across two universities delivering the same programs. Audio-recorded sessions were transcribed and coded in NVivo using a hybrid thematic approach: deductive codes drawn from CAIL and integrity constructs (declaration, provenance, fairness, verification workflows, governance) with inductive openness to emergent themes. Participants gave informed consent and all data were anonymized.

Results
Six interconnected themes described how AIAS implementation can strengthen or weaken integrity:
1. Enabling innovation while setting boundaries for responsible AI use.
2. Facilitating conditions: policy clarity, feasible declaration/reflection, and resources shape confidence and fairness.
3. Capacity building: practice-based training and peer exchange improve appraisal of AI outputs and reduce fabricated citations.
4. Pathways to adoption: governance models (rapid rollout vs. departmental leadership) influence consistency, legitimacy, and auditability.
5. Ethics in practice: equity of tool access, critical appraisal, and explicit attribution are essential to responsible use; superficial, undeclared AI reliance remains common.
6. Reframing pedagogy: aligning the AIAS levels with learning outcomes and authentic tasks reduces contract-cheating opportunities and supports transparent expectations.

Barriers included uneven access to paid tools, rushed or unclear policies, uncertainty about AIAS levels, workload constraints, and low student declaration rates. Where embedded in routine curriculum/assessment review, the AIAS could support clearer norms by helping learners develop audit trails (saved prompts/outputs), and improve equity provisions across programmes, enabling comparable integrity metrics and sector-wide benchmarking.

Conclusion
Positioned as an integrity framework rather than a compliance checklist, the AIAS can operationalize responsible AI use through mandatory declaration and reflection, equitable access provisions, authentic assessment redesign, and risk-proportionate verification. Institutions should publish exemplars, align the AIAS with programme outcomes, and provide staged professional learning to build critical AI literacy. Limitations include the two-site scope and qualitative self-report.

From Crisis to Collaboration: Rebuilding Research Integrity and Ethical Standards in Ukrainian Biomedical Science

*Dr. Vladyslava Kachkovska[1], **Dr. Emily Anderson**[2]*
[1]Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine, [2]Neiswanger Institute for Bioethics and Healthcare Leadership Stritch School of Medicine Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, USA

In light of the ongoing war, Ukraine is navigating complex national security challenges while also striving to uphold the principles of scientific integrity. This situation necessitates a critical examination of how to effectively balance the protection of sensitive or proprietary information with the ideals of openness, transparency, and collaboration in the realm of scientific research.
Ukraine is currently experiencing an unprecedented level of openness and collaboration with the Western world. However, this period has also witnessed a significant exodus of highly qualified scientists from various healthcare fields, resulting in a noticeable shift in the professional landscape. In the context of biomedical education and research, a significant number of faculty members have left Ukraine to pursue research positions abroad, which has facilitated the establishment of robust collaborations between Ukrainian and European universities. This development has enabled Ukrainian scientists to access a wider array of grant funding opportunities. Nevertheless, these advancements necessitate the fulfillment of explicit requirements regarding research integrity and the adoption of appropriate ethical standards within general practice – essentially demonstration of adherence to global standards that previously have not been disseminated, taught, or enforced in Ukrainian biomedical science. This report examines the broader implications of the challenges associated with research integrity, utilizing as a case study Sumy State University located in a conflict-affected region. We aim to illustrate a real-world scenario of the complete transformation of ethical education in real time, particularly focusing on research ethics for PhD students in medicine, while also addressing changes in ethical review board expertise, policy, and procedures. Additionally, we explore the significant role of international organizations, funding agencies, and academic networks in supporting leadership and faculty at Sumy State University to successful address challenges by offering guidance, resources, and frameworks that facilitate productive cooperation.

Authors Self-Disclosed Use of Artificial Intelligence in Research Submissions to 49 Biomedical Journals: A Cross-Sectional Study

Mr. Isamme Al-Fayyad[1], *Prof. Maurice Zeegers*[2], *Prof Lex Bouter*[3], *Dr. Helen Macdonald*[4], *Sara Schroter*[5,6]
[1]*Maastricht University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia,* [2]*Department of Epidemiology, Care and Public Health Research Institute, Maastricht University, The Netherlands,* [3]*Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Vrije Universiteit, , The Netherlands,* [4]*BMJ, United Kingdom,* [5]*BMJ, United Kingdom,* [6]*Faculty of Public Health & Policy, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom*

Objective
To analyze the frequency of self-disclosed use of AI in research manuscripts submitted to 49 biomedical journals and to identify types of AI tools used, the tasks they assisted with, and factors associated with disclosure.

Methods
We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of 25,114 empirical research manuscripts, including systematic reviews and meta-analyses, submitted between 8 April 2024 and 6 November 2024 to 49 BMJ Group biomedical journals. Submitting authors were required to answer new mandatory questions about AI use during the submission process. Disclosures were categorized by AI tool type and task-assisted. Logistic regression identified factors associated with disclosure. The research was registered in the Open Science Framework (osf.io/uvqms).

Results
There was a total of 25,114 eligible submissions: Asia (13,505; 53.8%), Europe (6,523; 26.0%), North America (2,795; 11.1%), Africa (1,196; 4.8%), Oceania (708; 2.8%), and South America (387; 1.5%). A total of 1,431 submissions (5.7%) disclosed the use of AI. The most frequently reported AI tools used were Generative AI Chatbots (812/1431; 56.7%) and writing assistants (182; 12.7%). The majority of authors who disclosed AI use reported using it to improve the quality of their writing (1,248/1,431; 87%). Additionally, translation (107; 7.5%), generating data and output (87, 6.1%), literature searches (49; 3.4%), analyzing or collecting data (44; 3.1%), image processing (36; 2.5%), code writing (15; 1.0%), and managing references (8; 0.6%) were mentioned as tasks AI assisted with.
Authors from South America (OR=1.75; 95%-CI: 1.22–2.49) and Europe (OR=1.28; 95%-CI: 1.14–1.45) were significantly more likely to disclose AI use than those from Asia. Conversely, each additional author reduced disclosure odds by 1% (OR=0.99, 95%-CI: 0.97-0.99). Acceptance rate, impact factor, type of journal, and peer review model were not associated with AI use disclosure.

Conclusion
We found that only a small proportion (5.7%) of submitting authors disclosed AI use, which is substantially lower than proportions reported in surveys. Improving the quality of writing was the primary task AI assisted with, and AI Chatbots were the most commonly disclosed tool. Authors may be uncertain about what AI use requires disclosure or may be hesitant to disclose it.

A Human Research Ethics Committee Strategy for Responsible Artificial Intelligence Research

Mr. Samuel Simango[1]
[1]*Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa*

The recent advancement in artificial intelligence has had such an impact on human research ethics that it has led to the need for a strategic rethink regarding the manner in which Human Research Ethics Committees ensure that responsible research is upheld. Whilst relevant issues such as data security and privacy had already been considered as pertinent for ethics review purposes, newer aspects such as AI transparency, algorithm bias and trustworthiness have recently been thrust to the forefront. The matter is complicated by the fact that AI technology is not homogenous in nature. Furthermore, the specific manner in which the technology is deployed in any given scenario has a strong bearing on the ethical issues to be taken into consideration.

This presentation details the design of an HREC strategy developed specifically for the oversight of AI research. AI research is defined in this sense as either research in the field of Artificial Intelligence or research which relies on the use of Artificial Intelligence tools. The strategy itself is based on Roger Martin's Playing to Win model which organises the strategy around five interconnected strategic choices. This integrated approach enables an HREC to determine its aspiration, playing field, unique approach as well as its required capabilities and enabling management systems.

The developed strategy introduces a formalised, staged ethics review process that incorporates an early risk triage system focusing on software approval and mandatory consultation with a technical expert panel that focuses on AI safety approval. This ensures specialised scrutiny of associated risk factors and effectively moves beyond considering basic consent checks to addressing broader ethical implications at the model and data level. The strategy relies on a governance framework which is structured around four core pillars of responsibility namely: (1) transparency and explainability, (2) fairness and non-discrimination, (3) privacy and data security, and (4) accountability and oversight. These pillars serve as the primary ethical dimensions against which ethics review applications can be assessed.

This presentation offers HREC administrators a blueprint for developing a strategy that successfully balances research innovation with the essential ethical protection of human subjects in the age of AI.

Identifying Barriers and Facilitators to Open Science in Cardiovascular Research: A Focus Group Study

Dr. Anna Catharina Vieira Armond[1], *Catherine Goodenough*[2], *Bobbi-Jo Green*[2], *Prof David Moher*[3,4], *Dr. Emilio Alarcón*[1,5], *Dr. Jean Rouleau*[6], *Dr. Jodi Edwards*[1,4], *Dr. Kerri-Anne Mullen*[1,4], *Dr. Rob Beanlands*[1,7], *Dr. Peter Liu*[1], *Dr Kelly Cobey*[1,4]

[1]*University Of Ottawa Heart Institute, Ottawa, Canada,* [2]*Patient partner, , Canada,* [3]*Centre for Journalology, Methodological and Implementation Research Program, Ottawa, Canada,* [4]*School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [5]*Department of Biochemistry, Microbiology and Immunology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [6]*Montreal Heart Institute, University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada,* [7]*Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada*

Objective

Open science aims to make research processes and outputs more transparent and accessible. It encompasses practices such as open-access publishing, preprints, reporting guidelines, and data and materials sharing. Despite widespread recognition of its benefits, most medical research, including cardiovascular research, remains inaccessible, with outputs often not shared publicly. It is currently unknown how effective open science policies are in changing scholarship practices, how much progress there is in their implementation, and what the barriers to achieving the benefits of open science are. This study aims to identify perceived barriers and facilitators to implementing and monitoring open science practices in cardiovascular research. By capturing diverse interest holders perspectives, we aim to generate evidence to inform a stakeholder-driven action plan that supports policy implementation and monitoring.

Methods

The study was approved by the Research Ethics Board and prospectively registered on the Open Science Framework (10.17605/OSF.IO/KFCUZ). We conducted virtual focus groups with seven stakeholder groups: cardiovascular researchers, trainees, journal editors, funders, administrators, patients, and cardiovascular societies. Discussions address four key themes: (1) challenges to implementing open science; (2) roles and responsibilities needed to foster adoption; (3) the effectiveness of existing open science policies; and (4) support required to enable implementation. We are using the Theoretical Domains Framework to map behavioral determinants. Sessions are recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using inductive content analysis in NVivo 14. Coding will be conducted in duplicate.

Results

Data collection is currently nearing completion and will be completed by the time of the conference. We anticipate engaging 50–60 participants across interest holder groups, achieving thematic saturation using the 10+3 rule. Preliminary thematic analysis suggests variation in perceived barriers across career stages and roles, including a lack of infrastructure and incentives, insufficient training, and concerns regarding patient privacy in data sharing. Reported facilitators include policy mandates, institutional support, and dedicated funding mechanisms.

This study will provide an in-depth, community-informed understanding of barriers and facilitators to open science in cardiovascular research. This study is the next step in our research program to develop a list of consensus actions for the cardiovascular research community to address open science implementation and monitoring.

1.F - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

College Research Ethics Boards of Quebec, Canada (REBs): Mandate, Governance and Resources

Dr. Emmanuelle Marceau[1,2]
[1]Cégep Vieux Montréal, Montréal, Canada, [2]Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

Objective
The development of research ethics in the Quebec college environment raises specific concerns for institutions and research ethics board (REB), given the particularities of this environment, and the respect of the principles of research ethics, as set out in the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 (TCPS 2). This study focuses on three priority issues for the college research ethics community: 1) the question of resources for ethics review by college network REBs; 2) the review of multi-jurisdictional research projects; and 3) the review of student course-based research activities. The aim of this study was to characterize these issues by drawing on the real-life experience of the stakeholders in the ethics review of research projects.

Methods
In order to sound out this community on its concrete realities with regard to these issues, we carried out a mixed real time Delphi study using the Surveylet platform, during which we engaged 31 panelists in dialogue over a total period of five weeks.

Results
Panelists reported a lack of human and financial resources, and the variability of some REB members' training and available continuing education. They also mentioned the fact that ethics review of multicenter projects raises tensions between administrative efficiency and local responsibility, with divergences over trust between REBs. With regard to student projects with pedagogical aims, their evaluation is deemed necessary, but responsibilities between teachers and REBs are unclear, and resources for implementation are insufficient. Proposed solutions include asynchronous training, harmonized tools and better collaboration between players. Tools were subsequently developed by the research team to meet the needs identified by the panelists. While this research produced some very interesting and rich results, it should be noted that the unfamiliar Delphi method limited the engagement of some panelists. Technical constraints on the platform restricted interaction, and some nuances in responses could not be captured.

Conclusion
The study sheds light on the ethical challenges specific to the college environment and suggests concrete ways of strengthening the practices, collaboration and resources of research ethics committees.

Protecting Anishinaabek Knowledge Systems

Dr. Lorrilee McGregor[1]
[1]*NOSM University, Sudbury, Canada*

Background
Anishinaabek (Ojibway) communities in the Great Lakes region have well-developed knowledge systems based on centuries of living with the land. Protecting Anishinaabek knowledge systems has become increasingly important as research activities in Indigenous communities by external researchers (academic, government, etc.) continue to intensify. Anishinaabek have developed ways to protect their knowledge systems from exploitation while striving to ensure that Indigenous ways of knowing, thinking, and doing are passed down to younger generations.

Objective
This study sought to strengthen understandings of Anishinaabek worldviews, knowledge systems, and Anishinaabek research governance.

Methods
Drawing upon engagement sessions with Elders/Knowledge Carriers, sharing circles, "nbaachewe" (visiting and storytelling), and key informant interviews, this study explored Elders/Knowledge Carriers and youth perspectives on how Anishinaabek knowledge systems have been controlled, transmitted, and protected, and the protocols for doing this. The researchers also aimed to increase researchers understanding of their responsibilities when conducting research in Anishinaabek communities.

Results
Anishinaabek knowledge is collectively owned and governed. The Anishinaabe language is foundational to Anishinaabek knowledge systems and is also a way to protect the knowledge. Sharing knowledge externally must be done cautiously however it is critical to share with young people within Anishinaabe communities not only for knowledge preservation but to also help heal from intergenerational trauma. Learners and researchers have a responsibility to develop long-term reciprocal relationships, to acknowledge the sources of knowledge, and not to misuse the knowledge gained. Conclusion: Anishinaabek communities have developed ways to protect their knowledge systems and researchers must be trustworthy and ethical when conducting research.

Beyond the Electric Fence: A Behavioural Systems Approach to Augmented Integrity

Mr. Matt McCoy[1]
[1]*Proofig AI, Melbourne, Australia*

Artificial intelligence (AI) is providing institutions with greater capacity to identify research integrity issues at both micro and macro scale. Amid this opportunity, AI integrity tools are often positioned as highly torqued compliance mechanisms to retrospectively reveal image and text integrity issues. Institutionally and culturally, this positioning is embedded within punitive and compliance focused frameworks that enforce integrity rather than lead it.

This paper proposes a conceptual application of a behavioural systems model to achieve an augmented integrity framework, where structural components work constructively together to deliver a decentralised and proactive research integrity culture. The model aims to expand research integrity well beyond the boundaries of AI's 'electric fence', integrating technological, behavioural, and structural components to strengthen institutional risk mitigation and reputational protection.

Combining behavioural economics, systems thinking, and implementation theory, the model demonstrates the utility of AI as a partner in research integrity through the combination of three interdependent layers: a technological layer where AI integrity tools provide enterprise-wide screening and issue detection capacity; a behavioural layer which applies behavioural economics principles including strategic nudges and reflective cues that are designed to promote ethical decision making at decisive moments; and a systems layer that implements institutional structures and policies to promote positive research integrity culture and practices.

The paper argues that successful adoption of AI integrity tools should leverage all three domains during implementation to reinforce researcher behaviour at critical decision points, and that institutions should include a broader array of qualitative and quantitative indicators than are conventionally used as measures of implementation success.

This conceptual model provides a policy-oriented roadmap for optimising AI integrity initiatives and cultivates alignment for technological, behavioural, and systemic factors to work in partnership to achieve institutional integrity objectives beyond the 'electric fence'.

Safeguarding Integrity and Security: A European University's Approach to Responsible Research and Collaboration

*Dr. Katleen Janssen[1], **Dr. Inge Lerouge**[1]*
[1]KU Leuven, Belgium

KU Leuven, one of Europe's leading research universities, has a long-standing solid institutional framework for research integrity, based on the European Code for Research Integrity as leading instrument. This code is supplemented by KU Leuven's own tools and guidelines, all of which aim to ensure and promote the responsible conduct of research and collaboration.

More recently, KU Leuven has set up a research security structure. The entire process towards this research security structure has been fully embedded in the research integrity discourse of the university, continuously focusing on balancing openness and protection in scientific research and collaboration. KU Leuven operationalizes provisions of the European Code on Research Integrity relevant for research security —such as fostering researcher independence, mitigating risks in research and collaborations, ensuring data protection, and promoting transparency in agreements— through policy guidance, awareness initiatives, supporting structures and advisory bodies. This multi-faceted approach strengthens both institutional responsibility and researcher support.

The research security structure includes a newly established Research Security Office, which provides first line support and training to researchers in the assessment of research security risks that could potentially compromise their research integrity. If these risks are considered substantial, the researcher is referred to the appropriate ethical committee. The Ethical Committee on Dual Use, Military Use and Misuse of Research reviews research and education collaborations, while the Knowledge Security Committee mainly reviews insider risks, e.g. related to the hiring of staff, the admission of PhD students, or visitors on campus.

This presentation will set out KU Leuven's policy on research security and show how it is embedded in the broader research integrity framework. It will address the lessons learned, not only in terms of good practices, but also as a contribution to the academic community's 'failing forward'.

Research Between Freedom, Security, and Self-Regulation: The Role of Ethics Committees in Germany

Dr. Michael Lentze[1], *Dr. Tobias Grimm*[1]
[1]*German Research Foundation (DFG), Bonn, Germany*

Contemporary research increasingly operates within a field of tension between scientific freedom and security-related risks. On the one hand, new discoveries are essential to addressing global challenges in areas such as medicine, energy, and information technology. On the other hand, technological advances—particularly in biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and quantum science—carry significant potential for misuse. The notion of "dual use" highlights that scientific innovation entails both opportunities and risks for security, the environment, and society.

The legal and regulatory framework plays a crucial role in ensuring responsible research. Researchers, institutions, and funding bodies are jointly responsible for establishing mechanisms that identify and manage risks in the dual-use context. In Germany, this framework operates within a delicate balance between the constitutional guarantee of academic freedom under Article 5(3) of the Basic Law and legal obligations designed to protect national and international security. Key instruments include the Foreign Trade and Payments Act (AWG), the Foreign Trade and Payments Ordinance (AWV), and the EU Regulation (EU) 2021/821 on the control of dual-use items. These provisions aim to prevent research outputs from being misused for military or security-threatening purposes.

To navigate this tension, Germany has introduced a model of self-regulation through Ethics Committees for Research (Kommissionen für Ethik in der Forschung, KEFs). Recommended by the German Research Foundation (DFG) and the National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina, these committees assess research projects regarding their ethical, societal, and security-related implications. They support researchers in identifying risks, implementing mitigation measures, and fostering a culture of responsibility.

This presentation will discuss the results of an analysis examining whether the KEF model adequately meets the dual requirements of protecting constitutionally guaranteed research freedom while complying with legal and security-related restrictions in the dual-use context. The findings suggest how self-regulatory mechanisms can contribute to reconciling scientific autonomy with societal and legal accountability. The presentation will conclude by outlining implications for policy development and institutional practice within the evolving governance of responsible research.

Integrity Through Partnership: How Strategic Industry-Academic Partnerships Strengthen Research Quality

Mr. David Malwitz[1], *Dr Anja Gilis*[2], *Mr Tom Lavrijssen*[2], *Floris Bove*[2], *Lisa Kruk*[3]
[1]*Johnson & Johnson, San Diego, USA,* [2]*Johnson & Johnson, Beerse, Belgium,* [3]*Johnson & Johnson, Spring House, USA*

At Johnson & Johnson, our commitment to delivering transformational therapies is matched by a strong dedication to research integrity. As a global biopharmaceutical company, we recognize that high-quality, reproducible data is essential to advancing science responsibly. This presentation reflects on a decade of experience managing a global external quality assurance (QA) audit program, designed to uphold data integrity in non-regulated research conducted in partnership with universities, research institutes, contract laboratories, and industry collaborators.

Our risk-based quality framework enables targeted oversight of research data, focusing on both compliance and business-critical risks to data integrity. Through structured risk assessments, data integrity training, and dedicated resources for scientists, we identify opportunities to strengthen traceability, reproducibility, and documentation practices. Close collaboration with internal and external stakeholders allows us to tailor QA support to the specific needs and contexts of each partnership, fostering a proactive and adaptable approach to research quality.

We will outline practical approaches to auditing non-regulated research data, including the use of structured checklists, reference guidance documents, and contract language that clearly defines expectations for study planning, data handling, and reporting. Central to our approach is a focus on proactive partnership rather than enforcement, working closely with internal scientific teams and external laboratories to co-develop fit-for-purpose solutions that align with good research practices and promote sustainable improvements in data integrity.

The presentation will highlight regional and structural trends, along with shared challenges and opportunities identified through more than 150 external audits conducted over the past decade. These audits span a diverse range of partner types including academic institutions, contract laboratories, and industry collaborators. The findings offer valuable lessons for strengthening research integrity in collaborative, non-regulated environments.

Supporting Research Integrity through Implementing an Institute-Wide Electronic Research Notebook

Dr Andrew Porter[1], *Dr James Bird*[2], *Dr Noemie Aubert Bonn*[3], *Zuzanna Zagrodzka*[3], *Prof Andrew Stewart*[3]
[1]*Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom,* [2]*Research Computing Services, IT Services, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom,* [3]*Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom*

Collecting, managing and sharing data is key to research. The refreshed UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity contains eight separate mentions of 'data' plus many references to responsible research that require good recordkeeping. However, the day-to-day collection of research data in academia continues to rely on individual researchers and groups curating their own data management strategies amid a complex array of tools and (often limited) training, which increases complexity and creates obstacles for FAIR data and open research practices.

The Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute, like many research organisations, include hardbacked laboratory notebooks as a key part of our record keeping policies. The disadvantages of paper records are well documented; therefore, we have implemented an Institute-wide Electronic Research Notebook (ERN) to better support our researchers.

While ERNs have been available since the 1990s, many barriers have prevented widespread adoption in academic institutions. This presentation will outline how we have addressed these locally, drawing on the Centre for Open Science behaviour change pyramid to provide the infrastructure necessary for ERN adoption. This includes centrally managing data, with secure access and backups supported by our IT and Scientific Computing Facility; drawing on a research culture model to engage users and respond to feedback; and distributing in-lab tablet hardware to enhance accessibility.

I will discuss how learnings from this local implementation feed into a wider UKRI Metascience Research project with colleagues from the University of Manchester. The presentation will explore how ERNs can support good research practice in practical ways – e.g. using templates and structuring metadata - and how implementation creates a framework for training, raising awareness of questionable research practices, and can potentially provide trust markers of real research activity to support the ongoing fight against paper mills.

Deliberative Lab Communication and the Practice of Ethical Science

Dr. Dena Plemmons[1], *Dr Kevin Esterling*[1], *Prof. C. K. Gunsalus*[2]
[1]*University Of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA,* [2]*University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, Urbana, USA*

In a previous study [Plemmons et al 2020], we developed a deliberative communication intervention called “Institutional Re-engineering Ethical Discourse in STEM” (iREDS) that encouraged a deliberative approach to lab-based discussions among the lab’s members regarding the practices of data management and authorship, and an exploration of the ethical dimensions of those practices. This present study builds on iREDS, both as replication and as an extension. Our goal in this project, entitled “Deliberative Lab Communication” (DLC), was to give lab-based research teams an opportunity to intentionally and explicitly discuss specific, project-related data management practices within their labs, and to examine how such communication might inform both understanding and perceptions of the relationship between formal data management plans and lab members’ day-to-day research practice. Method: primary procedures in this study – pre and post survey administration, facilitated discussion – were similar to those in the randomized control field trial on which this project is based. However, in the current study, the survey questions were amended, structure, content and delivery of the intervention material was different, there was no randomization into treatment and control groups. We also collected the lab’s written data management plan/policy both before and after the intervention to assess any changes.
To identify the effects of the intervention using observational data, we make use of two designs. The first design relies on a within-subjects comparison of post-test response distributions to pre-test response distributions. The second design is difference-in-differences (DID), which compares the changes in the treated group to the corresponding changes in a control group that was not exposed to the intervention. As was the case with the iREDS project, these results show significant effects of the intervention across several dimensions -- perceived importance of ethical practices, and climate and communication issues, but importantly and specific to this project, this deliberative discourse approach enhances the likelihood that every member of the lab will share an understanding of and a commitment to its data management practices, and the relationship between these practices and the lab’s formal data management plans, in part because they have been actively involved in shaping those practices.

Exploring Ethical Concerns on Data Sharing, Integrity, and Transparency Among Researchers at a Public University in Uganda Study

Dr. Paul Kutyabami[1]
[1]*Makerere University, Uganda*

Background
Data sharing is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of transparency and integrity in health research. It enhances accountability, reproducibility, and efficient use of limited research resources, particularly in low- and middle-income countries such as Uganda. Despite its recognized value, data sharing remains inconsistently practiced, often constrained by socio-political, institutional, and ethical factors. This study explored researchers' perspectives on the ethical and integrity challenges surrounding data sharing at Makerere University College of Health Sciences (MakCHS), a leading public health research institution in Uganda.

Methods
A qualitative exploratory phenomenography design was employed to examine ethical issues related to integrity and attitudes toward data sharing among health researchers at MakCHS. Using purposive sampling, 26 participants including academic staff, research fellows, and PhD students were interviewed in person or via Zoom using a semi-structured guide. Interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and thematically analyzed using a hybrid inductive–deductive approach supported by ATLAS.ti version 9.

Results
Findings revealed diverse understandings and practices of data sharing, reflecting both ethical commitment and practical dilemmas. Four interrelated themes emerged: (1) awareness and conceptual understanding of data sharing; (2) integrity and fairness in reward and proper attribution and recognition systems; (3) balancing researcher autonomy with transparency and accountability; and (4) institutional influences shaping transparency practices. While most participants acknowledged data sharing as integral to research integrity, concerns about equitable recognition and potential misuse of shared data undermined trust and openness. Additionally, the absence of clear institutional data-sharing policies and a siloed research culture constrained transparent practices.

Conclusions
The study underscores that promoting research integrity in data sharing extends beyond technical compliance, it requires cultivating fairness, trust, and transparent reward systems. Institutional gaps, including weak policy frameworks and limited incentives for openness, hinder the realization of data-sharing ideals.
Recommendations:
- Develop institutional reward and recognition systems that incentivize responsible and transparent data sharing.
- Establish clear, context-sensitive data-sharing policies to guide ethical and integrity-based decision-making.
- Foster collaborative and open research cultures that emphasize accountability, fairness, and trust.

Advancing Responsible AI and Big Data Ethics Education in Graduate STEM Training

Dr. Ilinca Ciubotariu[1], ***Dr. Tamaki Kobayashi***[1], ***Gundula Bosch***[1]
[1]*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA*

This pedagogical contribution describes the design and implementation of a graduate-level course aimed at cultivating both technical proficiency and ethical reflexivity in biomedical data science. Offered to STEM graduate students and postdoctoral fellows at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, the course responds to the growing need for researchers who can apply data-driven methods responsibly while navigating issues of transparency, bias, and reproducibility in the era of AI.

Structured across eight interconnected modules, the curriculum we developed guides learners through the entire big data workflow - from acquisition and curation to analysis, visualization, and FAIR-aligned management - while integrating sustained engagement with the ethical and epistemic dimensions of data work. We introduced case studies centered on the infectious disease malaria with a focus on observational study data and protein microarray data, and COVID-19 genomic epidemiology, to allow students to explore how big data and AI methods inform real-world public health decision-making, while also grappling with challenges of bias and privacy. Students examine diverse topics, including the structure and stewardship of biomedical data, reproducible programming practices, visualization ethics, and the social implications of machine learning.

A key feature of the course is its use of reflective assignments that merge technical practice with critical inquiry. Through weekly prompts, students investigate real biomedical datasets, evaluate their metadata and readiness for reuse, analyze genomic data to inform public health responses, and critique visualizations for ethical communication. These exercises encourage students to connect practical data analysis skills with broader questions of reliability, equity, and public trust.

The culminating project extends these reflections into applied practice, requiring students to reproduce a published analysis using open data and to redesign existing figures for a defined audience. Assessment emphasizes reproducibility, documentation quality, FAIR alignment, and ethical reasoning.

Preliminary outcomes suggest that students finish the course not only more confident in handling complex datasets but also more attuned to the moral and societal responsibilities of data science. This reflection-driven approach with case studies provides a replicable model for embedding research integrity and responsible AI training within data-intensive biomedical education.

I Write Like AI Because “I” Trained It: Kenyan Labour, Global Knowledge, and the Future of Research

Ms. Brenda Odero[1]
[1]*University Of Kwazulu-Natal, Kenya; South Africa*

“Please declare if you have used AI tools in your research writing and in what way”. This new declaration now appears in most research submissions’ portals and journals, reflecting the growing institutional effort to ensure transparency and rigorous oversight. Focus is often on plagiarism, authorship, and transparency, authorship accountability, and research integrity in the age of generative AI. While this focus on oversight and disclosure is essential, it often overlooks the hidden human labour that makes AI tools functional in the first place. Kenyan workers have played a central role in developing and refining large language models, labelling datasets, moderating harmful content, and improving system accuracy. Their invisible intellectual and emotional labour has literally trained a vast section of the “handwriting” of AI.

Paradoxically, the same workers, students, and researchers in Kenya now face the prospect of their work being flagged by AI detection tools and being asked to prove they did not rely on the very tools 'they' helped train. Simultaneously, Kenya’s longstanding ghost-writing and ‘academic support’ industries now face competition from generative AI that mimics their tone and narrative logic. The phrase “I write like AI because I trained it” captures the irony and foregrounds the ethical paradoxes emerging at the intersection of human labour, machine learning and research governance.

This presentation examines how current research integrity frameworks may obscure the human aspects of AI-mediated research by focusing primarily on output verification and plagiarism detection. It argues that overlooking the invisible workforce behind AI datasets constitutes epistemic justice, where LMIC labour sustains global knowledge production yet remains unacknowledged in its governance structures. Ethical implications arise when integrity frameworks value technical compliance over ethical recognition and distributive fairness.

Drawing on reported Kenyan experiences, this presentation positions AI as a critical site where justice, authorship, and accountability converge. It calls for research integrity frameworks that move beyond declarations of tool use to include recognition of the moral, social, and epistemic conditions that sustain AI systems and to restore fairness, transparency, and ethical accountability in global knowledge production.

Main Academic Ethics Violations, the Reasons Behind, and Choices of How to Respond: Observations by the Lithuanian Academic Community Over the Past Three Years

*Dr. Rima Sinickė[1], **Dr. Reda Cimmperman**, Dr. Birutė Liekė*
[1]Office Of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius, Lithuania

Objective
This presentation shows the results of a national survey conducted among the academic community in Lithuania: teaching staff (assistants, associate professors, lecturers, professors), research fellows, doctoral students and other researchers from universities, applied universities, colleges and research institutes.

Methods
A quantitative method - an online survey - was chosen to collect the data in spring 2024 [This is a study that takes place every two years. It was done in 2020, 2022, and 2024. The next one will be conducted in spring 2026, and those results will be shown at the conference]. A total of 316 respondents participated in the survey in 2024. The results were analysed using descriptive statistical methods.

Results
The most commonly observed violations in research conduct include “hypothesizing after results are known” and “p-hacking”, each reported by about 10% of respondents (Q. How often have you noticed unethical research being carried out in the academic community at your institution in the last three years?) Unethical publication practices - particularly segmented publication - were also reported, with 13% “sometimes” and 11% “very often, often” in the pats three years. Unethical authorship proved even more prevalent: most notably “gift authorship” (observed at least occasionally by 18% and “very often, often” by 23%). The main reasons identified for unethical conduct were systemic pressures, especially the pressure to publish quickly (65%) and secure funding (49%). Half of the respondents have experienced dishonest behavior by other researchers have not reported it or done anything about it.

Conclusion
Unethical behavior still happens in academic settings, especially in hypothesizing after results are known, as well as gifted authorship. The main reason is pressure to publish quickly and secure funding. Even though respondents see these problems, half of them choose to do nothing, seeing no point in acting, and even fewer turn to unit managers or institutional ethics committees.

Providing Orientation in the Investigation of Transnational Cases of Research Misconduct: Testing the Water

Dr. Sabine Chai[1], *Hjördis Czesnick*[1], *Mrs. Kirsten Hüttemann*[1], *Raffael Iturrizaga*[1], *Mr. Tom Lindemann*[1]
[1]*Austrian Agency for Research Integrity, Austria*

Background
With the benefits of increased international collaboration in research (OECD, 2022) also comes an increased likelihood of transnational cases of research misconduct. Due to unclear jurisdiction, differences between investigative procedures in the countries involved, and less immediate access to relevant information, the complexity of transnational cases tends to be higher. The relative share of such cases for individual investigative bodies, however, is usually low, creating a gap between the level of challenge posed by such cases and the experience of the investigative bodies. The network Orientation on Transnational Case Investigations ("Orientierung für transnationale Fallbearbeitung"; OTF) consisting of national agencies and institutional RIOs from four countries (Austria, Germany, Luxembourg, Switzerland) set out to bridge this gap. Based on an analysis of the issues that arose in 88 transnational cases and the steps followed in their investigation, we created supporting material for case investigators, including example cases, a decision tree for investigation processes, guiding questions for each step in the process, in-depth information on the research integrity landscape and legal situation in each participating country, a comparative glossary, and a collection of network contacts. This information is available in German, English and French at https://otf-integrity.eu/.

Objective
A qualitative pilot test will answer the following two questions: How well do content, structure, and accessibility of the website fulfill its intended role to support investigators? And how could the website and each of its elements be improved?

Method
Twelve persons responsible for investigating cases at research institutions in the participating countries will be recruited to (1) review the website and respond to open-ended questions on the content, structure and accessibility of the website and (2) work through one of two case scenarios using the guidance material provided. Based on the analysis of responses after step two, focus group discussions to reflect on the experience and co-create use cases will be conducted with the same group of participants.

Results and Conclusion
Results will allow the OTF network to improve the guidance material and plan next steps. We further hope to discuss the project with case investigators from other countries and identify synergies.

The Ethical Blind Spots of Open Science: Examining the Assumptions of Neutrality, Universality, and Trust

Prof. Rosemarie De La Cruz Bernabe[1]
[1]*University Of Oslo, Norway*

The promotion and practice of Open Science (OS) is premised on the promise that science, through open practices, will be more responsive to global challenges; reduce inequalities; improve quality, efficiency, productivity, and trust; democratize knowledge and address systemic inequalities; promote inclusion, diversity, and epistemic justice; empower research and societal stakeholders; respect human rights and knowledge sovereignty; and build global cooperation and solidarity. However, evidence shows that simply practicing OS is no guarantee of these promises. One clear example of such failure, explored in the Responsible Open Science Project (ROSiE), is the widening gap between researchers from the Global North and the Global South. Another is the incompatibility of OS practices with specific domains or knowledge production modes, particularly in the qualitative sciences. Yet another is how OS practices can reinforce existing power imbalances by enabling data exploitation, marginalizing diverse knowledge systems, and privileging those with greater resources and infrastructure.

These failures do not stem from insufficient adherence to OS principles but from the assumptions embedded in OS itself. The problem lies not in the absence of openness, but in the unexamined beliefs about what openness means and achieves. To ensure that OS lives up to its promises and avoids aggravating inequalities, reflexivity must become integral to its ethics, practice, and governance.

Reflexivity has deep philosophical roots. Socrates, famously credited for saying “the unexamined life is not worth living,” represents this tradition of critical self-examination—of turning inward to reflect on one’s beliefs, motivations, values, and actions. Applied to OS, reflexivity means: (1) examining its underlying assumptions and practices, including those widely accepted; (2) making explicit both the assumptions and their consequences; and (3) ensuring that recommendations for practice, ethics, and governance are informed by such examination.

This presentation will explore these underlying assumptions such as neutrality, universality, and transparency as trust-building and their coherence with broader human-rights and integrity frameworks, asking: what if the very assumptions that underpin Open Science contain the ethical blind spots that threaten its own integrity?

Inappropriate Image Duplication and Manipulation in Preclinical Osteosarcoma Research

Dr. Rene Aquarius[1], *Dr. Elisabeth Bik*[2], *Dr. David Bimler*[3], *Dr. Morten Oksvold*[4], *Kevin Patrick*[5], *Dr. Corrado Viotti*[6]

[1]*Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, Netherlands,* [2]*Harbers Bik LLC, San Francisco, United States of America,* [3]*Independent researcher, Wellington, New Zealand,* [4]*Independent researcher, Oslo, Norway,* [5]*Independent researcher, Bellevue, USA,* [6]*Independent researcher, Heidelberg, Germany*

Objective

While assessing biomedical literature for inappropriate image duplications and manipulations, we observed a notable prevalence of these issues in articles focused on preclinical animal models of osteosarcoma, a form of bone cancer that primarily affects teenagers and young adults. Further investigation revealed a 2021 letter by two clinicians (Bielak & Palmerini) who 'celebrated' the retraction of the 100th osteosarcoma paper, indicating that this research field might have been targeted by paper mills. Our goal is to assess preclinical osteosarcoma papers to determine the prevalence of inappropriate image duplications and manipulations in this body of literature.

Methods

We conducted a search in Dimensions.ai using the following search string in titles and abstracts: osteosarcoma AND (mouse OR mice OR rat OR rats). Journals that had published at least 100 articles matching this search string by December 31, 2024, were included in the analysis. These articles were then screened for image-related issues using ImageTwin, an AI-based tool designed to detect image duplication and manipulation.

Preliminary Results

The following journals met the inclusion criteria, having published more than 100 relevant articles: Cancer Research (n=588 articles), Endocrinology (n=224 articles), Journal of Biological Chemistry (n=161 articles), Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications (n=135 articles), Journal of Bone and Mineral Research (n=125 articles), Anticancer Research (n=119 articles), Oncotarget (n=107 articles), and Oncogene (n=102 articles).

To date, five of these eight journals have been assessed, revealing the following proportions of articles with image-related issues: Oncotarget (35.5%), Oncogene (24.5%), Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications (14.1%), Cancer Research (8.5%), and Journal of Bone and Mineral Research (6.4%).

Conclusion

Preliminary findings indicate that a substantial number of articles within this body of literature contains inappropriate image duplications and manipulations. The variation in the proportion of problematic articles across journals is striking and may suggest that certain journals have been disproportionately targeted by paper mills. This preliminary evidence raises concerns about the integrity of the preclinical evidence base for osteosarcoma research, which could pose challenges when conducting systematic reviews of animal studies or for developing patient treatment strategies based on preclinical findings.

A Governance-Led Approach to AI-Era Research Integrity: The University of Ibadan's Harmonized Compliance Framework

Mr. Abiodun Akindele[4]
[1]*University Of Ibadan, Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria,* [2]*International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), Washington DC, USA,* [3]*African Research Integrity Network (ARIN), Cape Town, South Africa,* [4]*National Council of University Research Administrators, Washington DC, USA*

Background
The evolving adoption of artificial Intelligence (AI) into human endeavors, especially in research, promotes, among other things, data fabrication (synthetic and otherwise), ghostwriting, plagiarism (including paraphrasing), and extensive paper-mill activities. To forestall the menace of the aforementioned research misconducts, the University of Ibadan document on Research Compliance and Integrity (RCI) remains the document to beat even in the age of AI because it prevents, detects and redresses research misconduct across disciplines before AI and in the era of AI.

Methods
The RCI is a product of reviews of extant institutional policies and national codes of conduct, plus a 2017 rigorous needs assessment among academic staff and various stakeholders' meetings. Thereafter, key outputs include, among others, the establishment of the University of Ibadan Research Compliance and Integrity Unit (UIRCIU), an RCI Audit Toolkit, Material Transfer Agreement (MTA) protocols, and reinforced grant- and ethics committee procedures, as well as mandatory certified continuing education for researchers, strengthened authorship through Intellectual Properties and Conflict of Interests regulations.

Findings
The gaps in awareness of procedural consistency were exposed by the needs assessment, e.g., in the context of informed consent processes, misconduct recognition and grant management. The RCI addresses these gaps with tiered controls: centralized governance and due process (UIRCIU), automated and human-centered detection (plagiarism software plus whistle blower hotlines), routine auditable trails (protocol approvals, amendments, MTAs, grant accounting), and mandatory training and mentoring. These combinations of measures create documentary and procedural barriers that significantly raise the cost and detection probability of AI-enabled fraud.

Conclusion
The University of Ibadan's RCI offers a scalable, governance-led model that adapts existing integrity mechanisms to AI-era threats. By integrating rigorous oversight, auditability, education, and enforceable investigation procedures, the policy provides an effective framework to deter, detect, and remediate sophisticated forms of research misconduct. However, continued investment in AI-aware detection tools and periodic policy updates are more than necessary because AI is evolving and can render the misconduct-proof tool of today ineffective tomorrow.

Keywords
Research Integrity; AI and Research; Governance; Audit toolkit; Whistle Blower Protection

Modeling the Carbon Emission Impact of Research Integrity Failures in Artificial Intelligence

Dr. Suresh Baral[1]
[1]*School of Engineering, Pokhara University, Kaski, Pokhara, Nepal*

Objective
Artificial Intelligence (AI) has arisen as a modern tool for analyzing various aspects of research in today's world. Improper use of AI without following the research ethics such as data fabrication, biased model deployment, irreproducibility, and redundant retraining, it can lead to high environmental consequences. The objective of the study is to expand and quantify the concept of research integrity failures in AI research and to demonstrate how research ethical lapses contribute to unnecessary carbon emissions.

Method
In order to achieve the objective, a quantitative model was developed to estimate energy consumption, wastage, and associated carbon emissions in AI research which breaches research ethics. For this a research integrity failure framework was designed to categorize major research lapses such as data fabrication, biased model deployment, irreproducibility, and other relevant factors. Each category was mapped to energy-waste parameters and the value of carbon emissions for corresponding categories has been estimated.

Results
After applying the model for the analysis, a case study of 2200 AI model runs, each consuming 520 kWh, with an estimated 15–20% integrity failure rate has been taken into consideration. It indicated that around 68,500 kg of CO_2 was emitted annually due to research misconduct data. Furthermore, the analysis using the research framework reveals that irreproducibility category of misconduct was the largest contributor to energy waste, followed by data fabrication and biased model deployment. These findings underline the consequences of research misconduct in AI and emphasize the need to integrate research integrity and ethical practices with sustainability considerations. Besides, it also demonstrated that unethical practices not only compromise scientific reliability but directly contribute to global carbon emissions.

Conclusion
Therefore, this study concluded and provided a measurable tool for institutions, funding agencies, and policymakers to evaluate both the scientific and environmental aspects of improper use of research integrity in AI research, and it also helps in identifying the primary categories of ethical lapses for strengthening research reliability in today's digital age.

Strengthening Research Integrity in Zambia's Health Research System: A National Authority's Empirical Approach

Mr. Samson Mabuchi Banda[1]

[1]*National Health Research Authority, Lusaka, Zambia*

Objective

To evaluate the effectiveness of Zambia's National Health Research Authority (NHRA) interventions implemented between 2020-2025 in promoting research integrity, with specific focus on artificial intelligence governance, Indigenous knowledge integration, and ethical oversight frameworks within low-resource healthcare settings.

Methods

Mixed-methods study conducted September 2024 - June 2025 analyzing: (1) NHRA policy documents and institutional compliance audits from 78 health research institutions, (2) pre/post-training assessments of 150 researchers on AI ethics protocols, and (3) semi-structured interviews with 30 stakeholders including Indigenous healers, policymakers, and ethics committee members.

Results

Policy Implementation Impact: Institutional compliance with research integrity standards increased from 52% to 92% following NHRA's targeted workshop interventions in 2023. Among trained researchers, 92% demonstrated improved awareness of AI ethics protocols in post-training assessments.

AI Governance Outcomes: Implementation of Zambia's 2024 AI Research Guidelines correlated with a 35% reduction in detected plagiarism cases across monitored health studies (n=45). However, 67% of institutions reported inadequate access to AI detection tools, highlighting infrastructure limitations.

Indigenous Knowledge Integration: Collaborative protocol development with five traditional healer associations enabled ethical incorporation of Indigenous knowledge systems into three national health studies. While community engagement improved significantly, intellectual property protection mechanisms remain incomplete, with traditional knowledge holders expressing concerns about unauthorized use.

Systemic Challenges: Compliance audits revealed that 60% of evaluated institutions lack dedicated research integrity officers, primarily due to funding constraints. Stakeholder interviews emphasized the critical need for South-South collaboration networks to address shared resource limitations and knowledge exchange.

Cross-cutting Findings: Regular integrity training programs showed sustained behavior change, with quarterly assessments indicating 78% retention of ethical practices six months post-intervention.

Conclusion

NHRA's comprehensive approach demonstrates measurable progress in institutionalizing research integrity within resource-constrained settings. Sustainability requires dedicated funding mechanisms and regional partnerships. Key transferable lessons include context-specific AI governance frameworks, participatory Indigenous research protocols, and integration of integrity metrics into national research evaluation systems

Safeguarding Trust: Ensuring Scientific Integrity and Inclusiveness in Climate Change Research and Innovation

Ms. Janina Bau[1]
[1]*European Association of Research Managers and Administrators, Brussels, Belgium*

Climate change presents emerging ethical challenge for the global research and innovation (R&I) community. Early findings from the EU-Funded RE4GREEN (2024-2027) project highlight growing disparities between low-income and high-income countries in terms of accessibility to sustainable technologies and resources, leading to challenges such as climate-induced droughts, water scarcity, food insecurity, and socio-economic instability. The RE4GREEN policy recommendations on "Safeguarding Trust: Ensuring Scientific Integrity in Climate Change Research and Innovation" highlights the urgent need to strengthen research integrity frameworks in climate-related research by promoting transparency, inclusiveness, and respect for societal values.

The RE4GREEN policy recommendations highlight the importance of open science and adherence to the FAIR principles, while also addressing global inequities in climate science and ensuring context-sensitive, sustainable solutions. These policy recommendations identify issues and risks related to research integrity including ethics dumping, governance gaps, and Global North biases that risk undermining scientific credibility and policy impact. Moreover, the policy recommendations call for the participation of the public, and implementation of ethics by design to ensure adherence to ethical principles.

It concludes that strengthening ethical foresight requires moving beyond regulatory compliance while embedding offer of trainings on research integrity within climate research and support collaboration on different levels while also including research ethics committees & integrity offices as well as early-career professionals in the development of curricula.

The WCRI 2026 would offer the opportunity for a wider dissemination of the RE4Green project allowing participants to explore the interconnection of ethics, inclusiveness and a sustainable framework as well as its direct impact on policy development. This submission aligns with the WCRI mission to explore the connection between research security and research integrity and the call for open and transparent scientific research.

Facilitators and Barriers to Implementing Research Integrity and Open Science Codes of Conduct: Perspectives of Research Regulators in Kenya, Malawi, and Uganda

Dr. John Barugahare[1], *DR. Tiwonge Kamwenda*[2], *Mr. Samuel Jacob Bengo*[2], *DR. Rosemary Kamuyu*[3], *DR. Elizabeth Bukusi*[3], *DR. Paul Ochanga*[4], *Ms. Hellen Opolot*[5], *Mrs. Irene Ssemakula*[5], *Beth Mutumba*[5], *Dr. Gowri Krishna*[6]

[1]*Department of Philosophy, School of Liberal and Performing Arts, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda,* [2]*School of Global and Public Health, Kamuzu University of Health Sciences (KUHeS), Lilongwe, Malawi,* [3]*Centre for Microbiology Research Kenya Medical Research Institute., Nairobi , Kenya,* [4]*Directorate of Research Coordination and Promotion, Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology , Dar es Salaama, Tanzania,* [5]*Directorate of Research Management and Quality Assurance, Uganda National Council of Science and Technology, Kampala, Uganda,* [6]*Department of Epidemiology Universiteit Maastricht, Maastricht, Netherlands*

Objective

Despite growing clinical trials in sub-Saharan Africa, there are sporadic research integrity codes of conduct and open sciences policies. We will present perspectives of key stakeholders on potential facilitators and barriers to developing and implementing research integrity and open science codes of conduct in three Sub—Saharan African Countries.

Methods

This is an in-depth interview study of individuals from national research regulatory bodies of Kenya, Malawi, and Uganda involved in research ethics and integrity policy setting. Sampling was done purposively. Interviews were conducted by two researchers, transcribed verbatim, coded, and analysed in NVIVO-v.15 software, using an inductive approach. Sample size was determined by data saturation.

Results

Twenty-two individuals (12 females, 10 males) participated in the study from Kenya (10), Malawi (6), and Uganda (7). Interviews were conducted between July and September 2025. Based on preliminary analysis, some of the major themes identified were strong appreciation of the value of both concepts and practices they embody, barriers, and facilitators to implementing codes and policies with respect to them. There is a very high rating of the value of both practices. Some of the major barriers to open science are worries about loss of intellectual property rights, difficulty in accessing final benefits or outcomes from shared data, inadequate infrastructure, and open science requirements being driven by foreign funders rather than local institutions. On research integrity, barriers included inadequate resources to disseminate the code of conduct, inadequate individual and institutional capacities, lack of clear institutional frameworks, and weak legal, policy, and regulatory frameworks. Facilitators for implementing both research integrity and open science were discussed as either already existing or those feasible to implement. They include: training, dissemination of codes and awareness campaigns; collaborations and stakeholder involvement in developing the codes and policies, and institutional commitment, to name a few.

Conclusion

The high rating of the value of research integrity and open science, and institutional commitment to research ethics imply potential effortless implementation of the relevant codes. However, there is a need to address various benefit-sharing and other worries around open science, and strengthening local human and infrastructural capacities for implementing both.

Special Issue Proposals: Findings From an Integrity Screening Process at a Large Publisher

Ms. Rebecca Barber[1], *Dr. Sabina Alam*[1]
[1]*Taylor And Francis, Milton, United Kingdom*

Objective
Special issues develop journal content but can be exploited by bad actors resulting in poor quality or fake papers. Since 2022 the Taylor and Francis (T&F) Publishing Ethics and Research Integrity team (PEI) has implemented a special issue proposal screening process. This retrospective analysis explores patterns found during screening to develop best practice recommendations.

Methods
We analysed 370 proposals escalated to the PEI team from 116 T&F journals across HSS and STM disciplines (September 2022-September 2025). We assessed Guest Editors (GE's), recurring GEs, and proposal sources by email domain. Initial emails were checked for inclusion and recurrence of GE's, duplicate titles and recurring themes.

Results
Only 5% of escalated proposals passed screening. Proposals were distributed between STM (55%) and HSS (45%) journals, with Physical Sciences and Engineering comprising 74% of STM proposals and Social Sciences comprising 52% of HSS proposals.

Overall themes included Environmental Sustainability (46), Education (39), Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning (31), Cybersecurity and Privacy (30) and Healthcare & Medicine (29).

52% of all proposals included 20 recurring GEs, with between 7-19 proposals each, and 145 of 576 GE's appearing multiple times. 15 rejected proposals were out of scope for the GEs research background. The most recurring GE, a Computer Science Professor, sent proposals as the sole GE across multiple topics, including Geomicrobiology, Food Studies, Irish Political Studies and Early Years Education.

Affiliations were from 72 countries, led by India (94), China (65), the United States (29) and United Kingdom (26). 4 proposals included GEs added without their consent.

252 initial emails predominately used personal accounts, led by gmail (121). 51 came from ieee.org emails, mostly in 2022-2023, while 42 used institutional email addresses.

Only 5 proposal emails included co-GEs. Of the successful proposals, 4 used institutional or ieee.org domains.

Conclusion
This study demonstrates the importance of a robust special issue proposal screening process. Findings illustrate the persistence of bad actors, with 52% of proposals from 20 GE's over 3 years and recurring ethical concerns including GE inclusion without consent, demonstrating the clear potential for significant integrity concerns.

An Artificial Intelligence-Driven Software for Automated Statistical Checks and Trustworthiness Assessment of Randomised Controlled Trials

Miss Yan Peng[1], ***Miss Nicole Au***[2], Dr Lizhen Qu[1], Professor Lyle Gurrin[3], ***Prof Ben Willem Mol***[2,4]
[1]Department of Data Science & AI, Monash University, Clayton, Australia, [2]Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Monash University, Clayton, Australia, [3]Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia, [4]Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Objective
Randomized controlled trials are fundamental to evidence-based medicine. Unfortunately, it has recently become apparent that around 30% are not based on genuine data, threatening the validity of systematic reviews and clinical guidelines. Current detection methods are slow and labour-intensive. Building on our proof-of-concept paper, we developed an AI-driven software prototype that automatically evaluates RCT trustworthiness efficiently and accurately.[1]

Methods
Our AI-driven software prototype uses an AI large language model (LLMs) to extract tables from PDFs and perform automated statistical recalculations to detect potentially problematic or fraudulent data, and checks distributions of randomised baseline data. It also synthesises publication and online information to score the TRACT checklist,[2] automatically verifying authors, trial registrations, and related metadata for assessing RCT trustworthiness.

Results
Our automated data extraction demonstrated good performance. In a validation sample of 35 tables, GPT-4 (OpenAI) achieved an F1 score of 0.748, while Qwen2.5 (Alibaba) achieved 0.949. We are finalising validation of p-value recalculations and data integrity statistical checks, and the completed results comparing automated and human calculations will be available by the time of the conference. The LLMs showed agreement with human reviewers on an average of 14 out of 19 TRACT checklist items. In terms of efficiency, the LLM completed assessments in less than 10 minutes per paper, compared with approximately 75 minutes required for manual review, indicating a substantial reduction in time.

Conclusion
We believe our prototype software has the potential to evolve into a powerful tool widely used by researchers and publishers to detect problematic RCTs. Future development will focus on automated report generation and an integrated email system to directly notify journals and publishers of flagged studies.

1. Au LS, et al. Using artificial intelligence to semi-automate trustworthiness assessment of randomized controlled trials: a case study. J Clin Epidemiol. 2025;180:111672.
2. Mol BW, et al. Checklist to assess Trustworthiness in RAndomised Controlled Trials (TRACT checklist): concept proposal and pilot. Res Integr Peer Rev. 2023;8:6.

How Mentoring Undergraduate Students by Research Integrity Professionals or Role Models Working in The Global South Institutions Could Promote Research Integrity at a National Level: The Nigerian Students' Experience

Mr. Christian Anyiador[1], *Miss Opeoluwa Asogbon*[2], *Mr Paul Adewemimo*[1], *Mr Moshood Adebayo*[3], *Mr Kenechukwu Obi Osuchukwu*[4], *Mr Faruk Abubakar*[5], *Mr Umar Husseini*[5], *Mr Ridwan Abubakar Isah*[6], *Dr. Chiedozie Ike*[1]

[1]*Ambrose Alli University. Ekpoma, Ekpoma, Nigeria,* [2]*Bowen University, Iwo, Nigeria,* [3]*Federal University of Technology, Owerri, Nigeria,* [4]*Igebenedion University, Okada, Nigeria,* [5]*Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria,* [6]*University of Jos, Jos, Nigeria*

Background
There is a unanimous consensus about the role mentorship plays in fostering research integrity. However, there are no case studies in Nigeria or in Global South countries with a similar academic geography and where research integrity structures are not well established. This presentation highlights how a mentorship relationship between a medical student and his lecturer and research role model led to a series of events that ultimately gave birth to the first National Undergraduate Research Association, which bases its principles on the responsible conduct of research.

Objectives
This presentation aims to highlight how formal or informal mentorship, especially by research integrity role models, could give birth to a national movement in research integrity, as exemplified by the birth of the Nigerian Association of Undergraduate Medical Researchers (NAUMR).

Methods
A public health lecturer and a recipient of the World Conference Anderson-Kleinert Diversity Award promoted good research practices through a series of lectures. Two methods were employed in the mentorship relationship: shared use cases and real-life stories of integrity, competence, and resilience. The other method involved innovative teaching methods such as drama and animations. While the personal characteristic of the mentor was not regarded as a method, professional values such as patience, humility, openness, meekness, competency, and empathy were instrumental in developing a strong academic mentorship. For the mentee, qualities such as curiosity, resilience, passion, focus, and critical thinking also strengthened the mentorship.

Results
An initial informal association, the World Students Research Club (WORC) was formed by the mentee, another student and the mentor. Due to the medical school curriculum, the organisation could not be formally established by these three members. However, the continued mentorship led to a series of experiments, trying different ideas, and within a period of one year, the ideas were accepted by the Nigerian Medical Students Association, which has now birthed the first Nigerian National Undergraduate Research Association.

Conclusion
Mentorship in research integrity could foster research integrity in low and middle-income country institutions where research integrity structures are not established. However, it takes intentionality and professionalism of both parties, to begin and sustain such relationships.

Guardians at the Gate: The Responsible Use of AI to Uphold Research Integrity in Africa

Prof. Philippe Emmanuel Mounmbegna Pouonkoussou[1,4], *Dr. Emmanuel Uchechukwu Modo*[2], *Professor Anslem O AJUGWO*[3], *Dr. Valentine Ikechukwu UDEGBE*[3,4]

[1]*Kampala International University, Ishaka-Bushenyi, Uganda,* [2]*Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria,* [3]*Madonna University, Nigeria, Elele, Nigeria,* [4]*University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Umuagwuo, Nigeria*

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has brought in a transformative shift in research across the globe, offering without doubt unprecedented opportunities to Africa to advance or develop its scientific initiatives. AI has a vast potential to streamline research procedures, speed up discoveries, and address some unique challenges facing education, healthcare, agriculture, technology, and climate change. However, these opportunities come with ethical challenges that must be addressed to maintain research integrity. This study weighs both benefits and challenges that have come into being with AI for the African research. While AI introduces efficiency, democratizes access to advanced tools, and multiplier innovation, other pressing questions arise: the bias of algorithms, lack of transparency, and threats to privacy of data. These very serious challenges could undermine or derail at least, the temporary credence of research unless tackled with urgency or properly managed. We lay down a framework for AI-assisted research in Africa from a perspective of responsible development that underscores the ethics behind cultural considerations. The importance of education and training in AI literacy, transparent policies, and the creation of AI tools that respect the integrity of research is highlighted. In this way, by blending international research benchmarks with contextual cultural tenets, African researchers can ensure that AI-based research is conducted in a way that is ethically sound and socially beneficial. Along with findings from qualitative research, data visualization is presented in the article to illustrate the current status of AI adoption, integration of cultural values into research ethics training, and ethical dilemmas confronted by African researchers. Hence, through this perspective, the article underscores the imperative importance of African cultural values in charting ethical research conduct. In strong contrast to western philosophy emphasizing individualism, knowledge within many African communities is considered collective, free, and bearable of moral injunctions pegged on the direction that research benefits the common good. By merging these cultural values with global standards, African researchers stand to pivot AI toward building resilient research infrastructures that will put Africa as the world leader in scientific endeavor.

Challenges and Opportunities for Women in STEM Higher Education: A Case Study

Dr. AKM Moinul Haque Meaze[1,2], *Dr. Mohammad Salim Zahangir*[2]
[1]*Asian University for Women, Chittagong, Bangladesh,* [2]*University of Chittagong, Chittagong, Bangladesh*

Objective
The main aim of this study is to examine the challenges and opportunities faced by women pursuing higher education in STEM at the Asian University for Women (AUW), Bangladesh that can reflect similar experiences at other institutions. The study also focuses on the equity and inclusive practices that promote a responsible and ethical academic environment.

Methods
This study employed a quantitative survey on the STEM students. The survey examined demographics, field of study, academic performance, STEM experiences, gender-related challenges and bias, institutional support, and career aspirations. Items related to perceptions were calculated using a five-point Likert scale, analyzed using SPSS, and also Chi-square tests were used to examine associations between categorical variables such as religion, residence, and CGPA.

Results
Data were collected from 150 of 175 STEM students, representing 11 countries. The results present the demographic composition, academic performance patterns, and the key challenges and opportunities.
Results show that while AUW provides a supportive learning environment, STEM students still encounter challenges: 21.3% reported strong family influence, 42.7% identified STEM as male-dominated, and 70% reported moderate to high levels of difficulty with coursework. Even with these challenges most participants (92.7%) expressed confidence in their ability to succeed, reflecting resilience and optimism. The correlation analysis indicated weak but significant associations between academic performance and factors such as residence and religion. These outcomes highlight the need for integrity focused institutional practices, including proper mentorship, unbiased support structures, and inclusive policies for the advancement of the women's participation and success in STEM higher education. Although this study focuses on AUW STEM students, the results may reflect similar experiences at other institutions, underscoring the importance of comparable support and policies to enhance gender balance in STEM higher education.

Conclusion
The main challenges are academic rigor, family and community pressures, gender related barriers, rural urban disparities, and institutional gaps. The opportunities are confidence, AUW's supportive environment, policies and strong motivation. AUW and other higher educational institutions should enhance STEM support, provide proper mentorship and industry links, and families and communities need to help women reduce barriers to inclusive STEM education.

Building Peer Networks for Ethical Scholarship Through Community Integrity Cells: An Inspiration from Kenya's Nyumba Kumi Governance Model

Dr. Martin Nganga Muigano[1]
[1]*Bio One Scientific Ltd, Nairobi, Kenya*

Integrity is one of the most important ethos of credible research but claims of unethical conduct have always been there in various fields. With the proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI), it becomes even easier for individual researchers to engage in data manipulation, falsification of facts, alteration of images, and AI ghostwriting among others. In research publishing, the onus for flagging off these unacceptable practices is almost entirely left to journals' editorial and review processes. However, it is possible that peers or colleagues closest to a researcher are most likely to be aware of unethical conduct as opposed to journal editors and reviewers. Here, I propose Community Integrity Cells (CICs) as a framework for promoting ethical scholarship. The model is inspired by Kenya's Nyumba Kumi community policing initiative. Nyumba Kumi (Swahili for ten houses) is based on indigenous African knowledge of accountable neighborliness. As a governance model, households are organized into small cells where they engage in monitoring of their local environment for collective safety and security. Based on this model, the CICs framework reimagines research institutions and universities as networks of small, peer-based integrity cells. Here, researchers take shared responsibility for research ethics. Like Nyumba Kumi, the framework proposes local-level vigilance, trust-building, and proactive prevention of misconduct. The proposed "Nyumba Kumi for Research Integrity" framework contains four pillars: peer micro-clusters, collective monitoring, anonymous reporting, and institutional responsibility. This model encourages bottom-up practice of integrity with a strong mechanism for early detection of misconduct. In this work, the conceptual basis of the model is laid out as well as its implementation in universities and the likely challenges and opportunities.

Decolonising Research Security: African Perspectives on Data Sovereignty, Indigenous Knowledge Protection, And Equitable Global Partnerships

Ms. Allen Mukhwana[1]
[1]*Science For Africa Foundation, Nairobi, Kenya*

Global research security frameworks have largely been shaped by Western priorities, often overlooking the distinct vulnerabilities and assets that African institutions seek to protect. While concerns around intellectual property theft and cyber threats are universal, African research communities contend with additional challenges rooted in colonial legacies of data extraction, epistemic marginalisation, and unequal power dynamics in international collaborations. This presentation explores how African-led approaches can enrich and reframe global research security discourse.

Africa's research security landscape is influenced by three intersecting dynamics. First, the continent holds invaluable assets i.e. indigenous knowledge systems, biodiversity data, and community-based innovations, that are vulnerable to misappropriation and commercial exploitation without consent (Carroll et al., 2020; Soulé, 2024). Second, fragmented legal and ethical frameworks across jurisdictions complicate cross-border data sharing and expose research participants to inconsistent protections (Moodley et al., 2021). Third, limited digital infrastructure and cybersecurity capacity heighten institutional exposure to data breaches and external surveillance (Akinyetun, 2024).

Recent policy developments reflect growing African agency. The East African Regional STI Policy (2022–2033) and IP Policy (2023–2033) embed research security within broader development strategies. National data protection laws in Kenya, Uganda, and South Africa align with GDPR principles while addressing local realities (Kenya Data Protection Act, 2019; POPIA, 2013). However, implementation gaps persist, particularly in ethical oversight, secure infrastructure, and enforcement.

This presentation argues for four foundational shifts: (1) recognising indigenous data sovereignty and the CARE Principles (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, Ethics) as central to research integrity; (2) co-designing, rather than importing, security frameworks that reflect African priorities and epistemologies; (3) investing in African-owned digital infrastructure and institutional capacity; and (4) restructuring global partnerships to avoid extractive dynamics.

By centering African voices, we move beyond deficit narratives toward equitable, trust-based collaborations. This approach not only strengthens research integrity on the continent but also enriches global understanding of what constitutes security, value, and ethical practice in an interconnected research ecosystem.

Research Integrity and Ethics Challenges in Conducting Research During Public Health Emergencies: The Case of Ebola and Avian Flu

Dr. Langelihle Mlotshwa[1], *Prof Pamela Andanda*[1], *Dr Natalie Evans*[2]
[1]*University Of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa,* [2]*Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, Netherlands*

Objective
Infectious disease outbreaks demand quick research responses, under conditions of uncertainty, urgency, and often high social vulnerability. Recent studies have looked at the research integrity and ethics challenges experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic; however, challenges are influenced by the characteristics of the pathogen and the behaviour of the population experiencing the outbreak. Preparedness therefore, requires understanding challenges experienced during diverse infectious disease outbreaks. This scoping review explores and systematically maps the existing literature on research integrity and ethics challenges encountered during the Ebola and Avian influenza public health emergencies.

Methodology
This scoping review followed the five-stage framework outlined by Arksey and O'Malley (2005) and the PRISMA-ScR guidelines. We applied Braun and Clark's (2006) method of thematic analysis to analyse and interpret the findings.

Results
A total of 18 articles were included which provide insights into the integrity and ethics challenges in the context of the Ebola epidemic in West Africa and the Avian Influenza outbreaks. Challenges are thematically organised: (i) Rapid research and ethical rigor in crisis; (ii) Data and sample sharing; (iii) The role of community trust and engagement; (iv) Conducting research on fragile health systems; and (v) Transmission-enhancing experiments. Some of the challenges were common to both, while others were specific to only one of the contexts due to the nature of the disease, as well as other factors such as institutional context and geopolitics. Overall, the findings highlight a range of integrity and ethics challenges that are faced by researchers during public health emergencies, which often reflect tensions between scientific rigor and urgent public health needs. Experiences from both Ebola and Avian flu illustrate the complexity of emergency research.

Conclusion
The Ebola epidemic and Avian flu outbreaks exposed critical challenges in the global research ethics and integrity landscape. The pressure to conduct research and produce rapid evidence risked bypassing critical ethics review processes. Lessons learnt must not only assist how we respond to future emergencies but also how we reshape the research system to be more ethical, fair, equitable and inclusive.

Towards Shared Research Integrity Standards: International Comparisons and Implications for African Universities

Ms. Thando Mdaka[1], *Mrs Tanya Coetzee*[2], *Ms. Leonie Louw*[3], *Mr. Sidney Engelbrecht*[4]
[1]*University Of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa,* [2]*University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa,* [3]*University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa,* [4]*King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Kingdom of Saudi-Arabia, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia*

As research institutions become more international, it is important to coordinate standards in research integrity. Wherever possible, coherence of principles promotes trust and accountability and ensures quality across institutions with widely differing resources and modes of governance. This study compares the U.S. Office of Research Integrity (ORI) framework with models from South Africa, Kenya, the United Kingdom and Canada, demonstrating how different scientific environments affect policy design implementation.

In the USA, the (ORI) has a well-established centralised structure that consists of clear guidance issued by the central office, standardised misconduct investigation procedures and mandatory reporting with national oversight. Public case registers and mandatory training in responsible conduct of research (RCR) additionally promote compliance and transparency. The UK model focuses on coordinated national guidance via the UK Research Integrity Office, balancing regulatory oversight with advisory support. In Canada, the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research, incorporates rehabilitative components, promoting remedial action (education/training), mentorship and capacity development in addition to punitive measures.

These global examples show that accountability can be combined with the pursuit of education and support, providing lessons for African institutions that are seeking to strengthen research integrity while maintaining autonomy. African universities in general have a less-centralised structure of management with relatively more autonomy to establish policy, train staff and monitor performance. Local flexibility creates the opportunity for institutions to adapt approaches to their context, but inconsistent case management, underreporting and lack of infrastructure continue to be prevalent issues.

This study will analyse institutional protocols, misconduct processes and training programmes in pursuit of harmonising centralised governance that will encourage consistency and reliability, as well as acting in the public interest. We will compare the requirements of a research integrity governance framework looking at policy and oversight; reporting and case management; transparency, learning and culture. African universities could benefit from lessons learned through ORI's clarity, UKRIO's harmonisation, and Canada's rehabilitative approach to support transparency, standardisation of complaint handling and national guidance with institutional discretion. This will ensure action guidelines for Southern universities by showing how universal principles are reconciled with indigenous values to build trust, accountability and ethical research practices.

2.G - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM

Global Trends in Time Lag for Retractions

Ms. Ann Beynon[1], *Rob Pritchett*[1]
[1]*Clarivate, USA*

Objective
This study investigates the lag time between a retracted article's original publication and its retraction notice to understand if the average lag has changed over the past ten years. The hypothesis is that the speed of retractions has increased due to more sophisticated tools used by publishers coupled with the increase of high-profile research integrity issues such as paper mills. There is a general concern that AI could exacerbate research integrity issues. Since retractions are one of the well-established ways to address research integrity problems, it is important to understand how quickly they are occurring.

Methods
This study uses Web of Science Core Collection, a multidisciplinary citation index database of 22,000+ peer- reviewed journals, and focuses on the last 10 full years of data at the time of analysis (2015-2024). Web of Science Core Collection indexes retraction notices, enabling this analysis of the difference between the cover date of the retraction notice and the cover date of the retracted article. Retracted papers from publication years 2015-2024 are studied to track differences in retraction lag over this 10-year period.

Results
Full results are forthcoming, but preliminary results show a wide variability of time to retractions from decades to one month. This study will investigate disciplines to determine if there are differences between retraction lag across disciplines, in addition to studying changes over time.

Conclusion
This study will be limited to the set of journals indexed in Web of Science Core Collection and therefore constrained by its selection criteria. The final results will add to the current corpus of literature on the topic of time to retraction which mainly has been focused on specific research areas. This study will be able to analyze all research fields for global trends.

Understanding Publication Barriers and Predatory Journals in Dental Research: Insights from Institutions in South India

Dr. Eby Aluckal[1]
[1]*Mar Baselios Dental College, India, Ernakulam, India*

Objectives
To assess awareness, experiences, and perceptions of publication barriers and predatory journals among dental faculty and postgraduate students in three South Indian dental colleges and evaluate their impact on scholarly integrity.

Methods
A cross-sectional survey was administered to 280 faculty members and postgraduate students from five dental colleges in South India. A validated structured questionnaire assessed understanding of predatory journals, publication barriers, institutional support and perceptions of impact on research integrity. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential tests.

Results
Out of the 280 participants, 48% said they were aware of predatory journals, yet only 22.5% indicated that they had received any form of formal training to recognize or avoid them. This difference was statistically significant ($p=0.002$). Awareness levels were comparatively higher among faculty than postgraduate students, though both groups demonstrated limited confidence in differentiating predatory outlets from legitimate ones. Publication-related challenges were prominently highlighted, with 58.2% citing pressure to publish as the most common barrier, followed by 54.1% who reported difficulties in accessing reputable journals due to financial constraints or restricted institutional subscriptions ($p=0.01$).
Concerning research behaviour, 18.9% of students admitted having published in predatory journals either knowingly or unknowingly, with a significantly greater proportion among postgraduate students ($\chi^2=10.4$, $p=0.001$). Respondents who had prior predatory publishing experience also displayed a notably lower perception of scholarly integrity when compared with their counterparts ($p=0.015$). Institutional support was perceived as insufficient, with 63.3% rating publication guidance and mentorship as inadequate ($F=7.12$, $p=0.004$). Furthermore, 72% of participants agreed that predatory publishing practices weaken the credibility of research outputs and diminish the overall reputation of dental academia in South India, underscoring an urgent need for systemic interventions.

Conclusion
Significant gaps exist in awareness and institutional support regarding publication barriers and predatory journals in South Indian dental research. To preserve research integrity and raise the bar for dental research in the area, it is imperative to fortify researcher training, create institutional policies, and encourage ethical publishing cultures.

Observatory of Open Science Practices: A Survey of Ten Leading Medical Journals

Constant Vinatier[1], *Ms. Ayu Putu Madri Dewi*[2], *Gwénaël Dumont*[1], *Dr Tracey Weissgerber*[3], *Vladislav Nachev*[3], *Dr. Gowri Gopalakrishna*[2,4], *Maud Scheidecker*[1], *François-Joseph Arnault*[1], *Dr. Nicholas DeVito*[5], *Guillaume Freyermuth*[6], *Dr Mathieu Acher*[6], *Margaux Millour*[6], *Gauthier Le Bartz Lyan*[6], *Inge Stegeman*[7,8], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[2], *Dr. Florian Naudet*[1]

[1]Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) – UMR_S 1085, F-35000 Rennes, France, France, [2]Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam University Medical Centers, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [3]QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany, [4]Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences Maastricht University, The Netherlands, [5]Bennett Institute for Applied Data Science, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom, [6]Univ Rennes, IRISA, Inria, CNRS, F-35000 Rennes, France, [7]Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head & Neck Surgery University Medical Center Utrecht Utrecht, The Netherlands, [8]Brain Center, University Medical Center Utrecht Utrecht, The Netherlands, [9]Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France

Objective
Transparency is essential for trustworthy biomedical research. Despite increasing attention, the extent to which open science practices are adopted and monitored in leading medical journals remains unclear.

Method
We conducted a comprehensive assessment of open science practices in ten leading international general medical journals. Policy audits were performed using the TOP2025 framework (maximum score = 27), and thirteen core open science indicators -including trial registration, data and protocol sharing (including intent to share), and use of reporting guidelines- were evaluated in articles published between 2020 and 2023. Eight validated automated tools were applied, and their outputs were compared with manual data extraction. We analyzed differences across journals and article types, accounting for technical limitations such as format inconsistencies. Finally, we examined trends in registration and data-sharing practices before and after policy changes in these journals.

Results
Transparency policies varied substantially among journals, with requirements generally focusing on randomized trials, while being less stringent for other article types. TOP Factor scores ranged from 1 (NEJM) to 13 (PLOS Medicine), with PLOS Medicine and Nature Medicine notably supporting replication studies and registered reports. At the article level, adoption of open science practices remained limited. Registration (99% [95%–100%] in RCTs vs 68% [55%–79%] in MA vs 15% [8%–27%] in other research articles), protocol sharing (95% [90%–98%] in RCT vs 67 [54%–78%] in MA vs 19% [11%–32%] in other research articles), and data sharing (78% [67%–87%] in RCT vs 64% [49%–76%] in MA vs 69% [55%–80%] in other research articles) were more common in RCTs than in other study types. Automated tools showed variable performance across indicators (F1 scores = 0.16–1.0), performing best on PDF formats. Policy changes, such as mandatory trial registration or data-sharing requirements, led to measurable improvements in all affected journals.

Conclusion
Although automated monitoring remains imperfect due to technical and format-related challenges, it shows promise for large-scale evaluation of open science practices. Developing a robust observatory based on improved tools could enhance trust, quality, and reproducibility in biomedical research. Achieving these goals will require collaboration among stakeholders and harmonization of reporting standards.

The Replication Target Selection Checklist

Dr. Merle-Marie Pittelkow[1]
[1]Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Institute of Clinical Nursing Science, Berlin, Germany, [2]QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Objective
Repeatability is fundamental to scientific progress, as robust discoveries rely on replications that accumulate evidence for claims and effects. Despite increased attention in the past decade, replication studies remain rare, with annual replication rates estimated at only around 1%. Several factors may contribute to this. Academic incentives prioritize novel and statistically significant findings, leaving little motivation for replication work, which may be perceived as less original or publishable. Encouragingly, the research landscape is shifting: dedicated replication journals have emerged, funding schemes now explicitly support replication studies, and journals increasingly issue calls for replication papers. These developments highlight growing recognition of replications as essential for making empirical research more transparent, cumulative, and trustworthy. However, the number of potential replication targets far exceeds available resources, underscoring the need for systematic, well-justified, and transparent replication target selection.

Methods
In this Registered Report, we developed a checklist to guide and document replication target selection in psychology. We employed a modified Delphi approach. First, we constructed a preliminary list of considerations. Second, we surveyed psychologists who previously selected a replication target with regards to their considerations and supplemented the list of preliminary items accordingly. Third, we incorporated the results into the preliminary list of considerations and sent the updated list to a group of individuals knowledgeable about concerns regarding replication target selection.

Results
Over the course of three rounds, consensus was reached on 13 of 18 proposed considerations, grouped into five themes: interest, doubt, impact, methodology, and feasibility.

Conclusion
The checklist captures reasons why a study was selected for replication, rather than prescribing why it should be. Its primary aim is to promote transparency by clarifying decision, making processes in replication research. Beyond this, it may serve as a tool for evaluating replication decisions, informing discussions about resource allocation, and identifying priority areas for replication. Researchers can also use it when drafting study protocols, while funders may apply it to assess applications for replication projects. Overall, the checklist supports more systematic, transparent, and accountable approaches to replication target selection.

Editors and Research Articles: Quantifying Self-Publication in Biomedical Research

Mr. Cédric Lemarchand[1], *Dr. Florian Naudet*[1,2,3], *Ms. Tala Jajieh*[4], *Pr. Silvy Laporte*[4], *Dr. Marc-Antoine Pencolé*[5], *Mr. Louën Ropers*[6], *Dr. Alexandre Scanff*[1,2], *Dr. Ioana Cristea*[7], *Dr. Clara Locher*[1,2]
[1]*Université de Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset, Rennes, France,* [2]*CHU de Rennes, Rennes, France,* [3]*Institut Universitaire de France, , France,* [4]*Université Jean Monnet, Mines Saint-Étienne, Inserm, U1059, SAINBIOSE, CHU de Saint-Étienne, Saint-Étienne, France,* [5]*Université Paris Cité, Centre de Recherche des Cordeliers, Paris, France,* [6]*CHD Vendée, La Roche-sur-Yon, France,* [7]*University of Padova, Padova, Italy*

Objective
In 2021, a large-scale survey highlighted that in a subset of biomedical journals, a few authors –often serving on the editorial board– published disproportionately and experienced shorter acceptance times. Building on these findings, our study aims to specifically quantify editors' research articles (i.e., original articles, case reports, and reviews) within the journals in which they operate.

Methods
We selected journals indexed in Open Editors, a dataset that collects publicly available information on journal editorial boards through web scraping. Journals not indexed in PubMed, mega-journals, and those with very low publication volume were excluded. For the remaining journals, we linked the 2022 editorial boards from Open Editors to authors of research articles published between 2020 and 2023. For each journal, we then computed indicators describing publication patterns: the percentage of research articles (i) by the most prolific editor, (ii) with at least one editor, and (iii) by the most prolific author, as well as publication lags for each article.

Results
Across the 1,623 journals studied, the median and 95th percentile of research articles are 1.78% and 6.7% for those co-authored with the most prolific editor, 12.1% and 41.1% for those with at least one editor, and 2.5% and 7.9% for those with the most prolific author. An editor was among the most prolific author(s) in 45.0% of the journals. The median and 5th percentile publications lags are 99 and 35 days for authors, 95 and 33 days for editors, and 85 and 12 days for editors-in-chief. An in-depth examination of journals where the most prolific editor co-authored more than 6.7% (95th percentile) found a median impact factor of 3, and a median h-index of 42 for their most prolific editor(s).

Conclusion
In 5% of cases, an editor contributes to approximately >7% of the articles published in their own journal. In nearly half of the journals, the most prolific author is an editor. These results need to be complemented by a qualitative approach to examine whether research articles authored by editors appropriately address potential conflicts of interest, as required by COPE recommendations, and to better understand the motivations underlying this practice.

Characteristics and Practices of Predatory Journals and Publishers: A Scoping Review

Ms. Amani Abu-Shaheen[1], *Sara Schroter*[2,3], *Prof. Maurice Zeegers*[1], *Dr. Helen Macdonald*[3], *Dr. Melissa Rethlefsen*[4], *William White*[4], *Dr Lauren Adkins*[5], *Prof Lex Bouter*[6,7]

[1]*Department of Epidemiology, Care and Public Health Research Institute, Maastricht University, The Netherlands,* [2]*UK Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK, UK,* [3]*BMJ, London, UK, London, UK,* [4]*Health Sciences Library & Informatics Center, University of New Mexico, New Mexico, United States of America, New Mexico, United States of America,* [5]*Health Science Center Libraries, University of Florida, Florida, United States of America, United States of America,* [6]*Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam Universities Medical Center, The Netherlands, The Netherlands,* [7]*Faculty of Humanities, Department of Philosophy, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands, The Netherlands*

Objective

Predatory publishers are outlets that “publish counterfeit journals to exploit the open-access model in which the author pays” and that are “dishonest and lack transparency”. Predatory journals adapt quickly and apply different tactics to avoid identification and measures designed to stop them, which is an implicit limitation to any static definition and fixed checklist to identify them. This adaptive behavior necessitates that our understanding of predatory characteristics be continually revised and modified. Moreover, a previous scoping review of the characteristics of predatory journals excluded non-empirical insights. Also, the proliferation of AI tools has substantially easier to create fraudulent scientific papers, aligning perfectly with the nature of predatory publishers, thereby contributing to the surge in predatory journals. Thus, our scoping review aims to identify the current characteristics and practices of predatory publishers/journals and to develop a draft taxonomy of predatory journals characteristics.

Methods

A scoping review will be conducted by searching MEDLINE, Scopus, Embase, Academic Search Premier, ProQuest, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, complemented by searching grey literature, white papers, and websites of key organizations and publishers. Articles published between 2010–2025 in any language will be included, encompassing empirical, non-empirical, opinion, and commentary sources describing characteristics of predatory journals. A two-stage screening process will be conducted using Covidence. Data extraction will capture bibliographic details, article type, predatory journal reported characteristics, and proposed definitions. Quantitative data will be summarized descriptively, while thematic analysis will be used to draft a taxonomy of predatory publishing practices.

Results

A total of nearly 12,000 articles were identified during the search process. After removing approximately 5,000 duplicates, screening and data extraction of eligible publications are being conducted in line with the established study protocol.

Conclusion

Our scoping review will use both quantitative and qualitative methods, providing depth to the identification of characteristics of predatory journals. The data extraction and data analyses will be finalized in early April 2026, which will enable us to present the findings of the scoping review at the 9th WCRI.

Research Security: An Emerging Dimension of Research Integrity and of Responsible Conduct of Research

Mr. Shawn McGuirk[1], *Anh-khoi Trinh*[1], *Dr. Joséphine Uwineza*[1]
[1]*Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), Ottawa, Canada*

The open and collaborative global research enterprise is underpinned by researchers' commitments to global norms, principles, and values. This includes adherence to behaviours and practices associated with the responsible conduct of research, which are key to enabling and sustaining rigorous research that promotes public trust in research findings, as well as equitable and reciprocal research collaborations. Yet, while openness and international engagement remain central to scientific progress, the increasing sophistication of cyber threats, strategic targeting of sensitive research, and misuse of dual-use technologies exposes researchers and research-performing organizations to growing risks of malign influence, interference, and misappropriation of their critical work. These risks, in turn, can promote behaviours and practices that are incompatible with the responsible conduct of research and that threaten the integrity of the global research ecosystem.

This presentation will describe how research security intersects with research integrity, what types of behaviours and practices are associated with research security risks, and what measures are being implemented in Canada to address them. Notably, we will outline how Canada's approach has been guided by international frameworks, such as the G7 Common Values and Principles of Research Security and Integrity, which define research security as a set of actions that safeguard the integrity of research and that must be advanced as a shared responsibility across all actors in the research ecosystem — both domestically and internationally. Canada's actions include the implementation of risk-targeted policies to federal research funding, to set guardrails for research partnerships with the private sector and for academic collaborations that aim to advance a sensitive technology research area. Furthermore, the Government of Canada has developed and disseminated training, tools, and supports for researchers and institutions to build their awareness of risks, conduct case-by-case due diligence, manage conflicts of interests, and implement mitigation strategies without compromising on academic freedom, open science, and international collaboration.

By framing research security as an integral dimension of research integrity, and by drawing from lessons learned in the Canadian context, this presentation aims to catalyze further discussions on how to embed research security considerations into global good practices for the responsible conduct of research.

Artificial Intelligence: Practical and Philosophical Impacts on Research and Research Evaluation

Dr. Tobias Grimm[1], *Dr. Michael Lentze*[1]
[1]*German Research Foundation (DFG), Bonn, Germany*

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) systems and the increasing use of large language models (LLMs) in the design of research projects, proposal writing, and research evaluation are generating unprecedented practical and philosophical challenges. As AI becomes deeply embedded in the research process, the question arises: What defines responsible research in an AI-driven environment, and how should this understanding shape the use of AI in scientific practice? Furthermore, how can modern AI tools be integrated into the evaluation of research and funding proposals in a responsible and transparent manner?

The key challenge lies in the reciprocal relationship between the development of practical guidelines for AI use and an evolving understanding of good research practice. A shared notion of integrity and responsibility in AI-assisted research and research funding is essential - not only to guide behavior but also to inform the creation of new regulatory frameworks and ensure compliance. Central to this discourse is the question: What constitutes good and responsible use of AI? This must be addressed individually by researchers, evaluators, and funding organizations through reflections on four sub-questions: How can AI be used beneficially? How can risks - for individuals and third parties - be minimized? How should accountability be distributed? And how can human oversight be maintained? Developing a coherent framework that consolidates these perspectives is a necessary step toward maintaining research integrity in the age of AI. Yet, for regulators, defining such a framework is only the beginning. Mechanisms must also be established to ensure compliance: How can violations be identified or allegations investigated? Even with evolving regulatory and technical tools, uncertainty remains. How should the research system respond if AI begins to dominate every stage - from project conception and evaluation to execution and publication - creating a self-reinforcing, AI-driven research loop?

This presentation will explore these questions, presenting conceptual and practical approaches for safeguarding responsible research and evaluation in the era of pervasive AI.

Supporting Funders to Promote Transparency in Clinical Trials: A Mixed-Methods, Multi-Stakeholder Approach

Dr. Delwen Franzen[1], *Dr. Friederike Kohrs*[1], *Samruddhi Yerunkar*[1], ***Ms. Maia Salholz-Hillel***[1]
[1]*BIH-QUEST Center for Responsible Research @ Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany*

Transparency is core to responsible research and research integrity: it enables the appraisal of research quality, mitigates biases, and facilitates evidence synthesis. Clinical trials warrant particular scrutiny because they involve human participants and inform medical decision-making. Yet trials often lack transparency; for example, trial results are often delayed, unavailable, or poorly linked. Insufficient transparency distorts medical knowledge and undermines evidence-based medicine.

Research funders are uniquely positioned to drive improvements in trial transparency through their policies, grant evaluation, compliance monitoring, and sector-wide influence. While prior studies have examined funders' policies, less is known about funders' efforts, challenges, and needs to support transparency. Furthermore, funders complement others in this space towards facilitating transparency; participatory research in dialogue with all groups promotes understanding of their interplay and reveals promising actions across the landscape.

In this talk, we present the Empowering Funders for Enhanced Clinical Trial Transparency (EFFECTT) project – a mixed-methods, multi-stakeholder project aimed at developing practical solutions for funders to strengthen clinical trial transparency. We share findings from interviews with international, non-commercial funders (n = 19) exploring their perceived roles, current measures, and needs around monitoring and supporting transparency. Interviews revealed wide-ranging differences, with some funders seeing limited responsibility towards transparency and others exploiting their crucial positioning. Similarly, existing measures varied widely, from recommendations and policies, to check-ins with investigators, to monitoring and annual audits. These findings informed the design of co-creation workshops with funders, patient representatives, clinical investigators, registries, and transparency advocates to ideate resources for improving transparency. These workshops surfaced opportunities for continued exchange and informed the development of a portfolio of resource ideas to promote trial transparency. We present the iterative development of one resource, refined through stakeholder input, and present plans for its implementation and adoption.

Through this project, we built and sustained relationships with funders and other stakeholders, bridging academic research and expert engagement to pursue practical, evidence-based reform. We share broader lessons learned from our community-informed approach to strengthening research integrity. These insights extend to meta-research beyond funders, trials, or transparency, and inform future work at the intersection of the study and practice of research integrity.

Rethinking (Un)Blinding in Biomedical Proposal Peer Review: A Multi-Stakeholder Qualitative Study

Prof. Kris Dierickx[1], *Dr. Farizah Mezer Anami*[1], *Dra Seba Qussini*[1]
[1]*Centre for Biomedical Ethics, Faculty Medicine, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*

Objectives
Many peer review attributes are widely criticized, and remain poorly investigated, particularly in the context of proposals' peer review. 1 This study aims to explore the diverse perspectives of stakeholders regarding the role of (un)blinding in proposals' peer review and the implications of open peer review, as part of the recent open science movement, specifically in biomedical research proposals' peer review.

Design
To describe participants' perspectives as constructed through their recent experiences, we have conducted a generic descriptive qualitative study within a constructivist paradigm, using semi-structured interviews, to gather insights from reviewers, applicants and peer review scholars. Twenty-three participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling from funding agencies in Belgium and Qatar, with whom no prior relationship had been established. Interviews were conducted between June 2024 and February 2025 by the first author (SQ, a PhD student). Transcribed interviews were analyzed according to the 6-step thematic framework analysis described by Braun & Clarke, 2017 .2 Initially, auto-generated transcripts were read and checked for in-depth familiarization with the data, this was followed by a line-by-line inductive coding, conducted iteratively after each set of two interviews. We followed the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Studies (COREQ) guidelines.

Results
Codes with shared characteristics were grouped into categories and ultimately three overarching themes were generated as follows: 1) the importance of increased transparency in fund allocation procedures while maintaining blinded reviewers' identities, 2) open peer review as a feasible approach for enhancing transparency and accountability in proposals' peer review, and 3) a growing critical stance toward traditional peer review systems, calling for alternative models like baseline or lottery funding procedures. Collectively, the results shed light on the perceived advantages and limitations of different (un)blinding models and provide an understanding of how (un)blinding influences the fairness and objectivity of fund allocation decisions.

Conclusion
There is persistent preference for double-blinded review within the context of our study, however, the shortcomings of blinding are more evident, especially in light of current challenges within the funding landscape. Simultaneously, the importance of greater openness in peer review, and increased transparency in fund allocations procedures are needed.

Research Ethics and Heritage Management: Safeguarding Integrity in Archaeological Practice in Ghana

Mr. Dennis Elliot Allotey[1]
[1]*University Of Ghana, Accra, Ghana*

Objective
This study explores how ethical standards and research integrity principles are applied in archaeological practice and heritage management in Ghana. It seeks to evaluate the challenges researchers face in balancing academic inquiry, cultural sensitivity, and community participation while safeguarding the authenticity and preservation of Ghana's archaeological heritage.

Methods
The research adopts a qualitative approach, combining field observations from archaeological projects in the Greater Accra Region with semi-structured interviews involving heritage officers, university researchers, and community elders. It also draws on policy reviews of the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB) and international frameworks such as the UNESCO 1970 Convention on cultural property. The analysis focuses on consent practices, data ownership, and ethical accountability in fieldwork and post-excavation reporting.

Results
Findings reveal that while institutional ethical codes exist, their practical enforcement remains inconsistent due to limited oversight, funding constraints, and inadequate researcher-community dialogue. Cases of unreported findings, restricted data sharing, and community mistrust highlight ethical vulnerabilities in current research systems. However, collaborative field models that integrate local custodianship and transparent reporting demonstrate greater integrity and sustainability in heritage preservation.

Conclusion
Promoting research integrity in archaeology requires institutionalizing ethics education, ensuring participatory frameworks for local communities, and adopting open-access data standards. The study underscores the importance of aligning archaeological ethics with national development and cultural policy priorities, offering insights into how transparent research practices can strengthen trust between scholars, institutions, and society. This contribution emphasizes the intersection of research ethics, heritage management, and sustainable cultural governance in Africa.

3.C - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM

An Expert-Informed Taxonomy of Interventions to Foster Reproducible Research Practices: A Delphi Consensus Study

Ms. Ilse De Jong[1], *Ms. Pooja Aryal*[2], *Prof. Rosemarie De La Cruz Bernabe*[2], *Prof Lex Bouter*[3,5], *Dr. Panagiotis Kavouras*[2], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[3], *Prof. Mads Sørensen*[4], *Dr. Joeri Tijdink*[1]
[1]*Department of Ethics, Law, and Humanities, Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, Netherlands,* [2]*Centre for Medical Ethics, Institute of Health and Society, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway,* [3]*Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, Netherlands,* [4]*Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark,* [5]*Department of Philosophy, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands*

Objective
While various interventions have been proposed to foster reproducible research practices, no unified framework or taxonomy exists for categorizing these interventions. To address this gap, the TRUSTparency (https://trustparency-project.eu/) Delphi study aims to create an expert-informed, consensus-based taxonomy of reproducibility interventions at relevant stages of the research cycle across different epistemic contexts.

Methods
The study protocol was preregistered (https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/3V97E). Experts in reproducibility were invited to participate in multiple rounds of online surveys. Seventy-seven participants working in 27 countries and different disciplines responded to Round 1 (September-October 2025). The next rounds will be completed before March 2026. In Round 1, participants rated their agreement with descriptions of six research cycle phases and their relevance for facilitating reproducible research practices on a 5-point Likert scale, and provided arguments and suggestions for changes. In subsequent rounds, participants will receive feedback reports summarizing previous results. These rounds will focus on refining the taxonomy and rating the importance of (types of) interventions identified through earlier work.

Results
In Round 1, for all six phases of the research cycle, over 70% of participating experts agreed with the suggested description. More than 90% rated the “design of the study”, “data collection”, “data analysis”, and “report the findings” phases as very or extremely relevant for facilitating reproducible research practices. Consensus on the relevance of the “formulate a research question/hypothesis” and “post-publication” phases was lower, but still above 70%. Post-publication activities such as replication and corrections, though important, were argued to often be outside of the original research team’s control. Overall, these findings indicate broad expert consensus that all research cycle phases are important for research reproducibility. Subsequent rounds will further refine the taxonomy and clarify the relative importance of specific intervention types.

Conclusion
Preliminary results demonstrate expert agreement on the relevance of all research cycle phases for fostering reproducible research practices. During the WCRI2026, we will present the results and propose a consensus-based taxonomy of interventions, providing the research community with a practical framework to foster reproducible research practices across diverse disciplines, and informing next steps in the TRUSTparency project.

Measuring Responsible Supervision of PhD candidates

Dr. Tamarinde Haven[1]
[1]*Tilburg University, Netherlands*

Objective
To develop and validate a measurement instrument for the responsible supervision of PhD candidates in the context of responsible research.

Methods
I applied the facet method to develop items to measure responsible supervision. Content validity was examined through conducting interviews with different stakeholders. They provided in-depth reflections on the relevance, completeness and comprehensiveness of the items, which were analysed with inductive content analysis. Next, I conducted a pilot study where the modified items and existing, validated instruments were sent out to pairs of PhD supervisor-PhD candidate. Convergent validity will be inspected by comparing correlations between items and existing constructs. Finally, I will conduct a university-wide validation study to examine construct validity through factor analysis and reliability using Cronbach's alpha.

Results
Interviews resulted in modifications in wording to improve clarity and correct interpretation. Inductive content analysis revealed that the goal of such an instrument matters (self-evaluation vs. research) and that the institutional climate has to be ready for such reflections to take place (in hostile environments, instrument scores could perpetuate existing challenges). The pilot data collection (N = 30 pairs) will conclude in October. The validation study (aiming for N = 100) will commence in January and run until March.

Conclusion
I will have developed, piloted, and validated a measurement instrument where PhD supervisors reflect on their own behaviour, and PhD candidates reflect on their supervisors' behaviour. The instrument can be used for both research and self-evaluation, though the latter should be accompanied by a well-developed institutional culture of care.

Estimating the Replicability of Brazilian Biomedical Science: Results from the Brazilian Reproducibility Initiative

Prof. Olavo Amaral[1], *Brazilian Reproducibility Initiative*[2]
[1]*Federal University of Rio De Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil,* [2]*Consortium author list available at https://osf.io/uxbtf*

Objective
Biomedical research in Brazil expanded rapidly over the last three decades, with no systematic assessment of the replicability of its findings. With this in mind, we set up the Brazilian Reproducibility Initiative, a multicenter replication of published experiments from Brazilian biomedical science.

Methods
We used a 20-year sample of articles published by Brazilian groups to search for experiments using three common experimental methods – the MTT assay, the reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), and the elevated plus maze –, using rodents or cells as experimental models. Each experiment was sent for direct replication by 3 independent labs from a consortia of 56 labs across Brazil, who were blinded to the original result and developed replication protocols independently. Methods are detailed in https://osf.io/6av7k/, and analysis was performed according to a preregistered plan available at https://osf.io/9rnuj.

Results
Data was collected for 143 replications of 56 experiments; of these, 97 replications of 47 experiments were considered valid by an independent committee. Replication rates for these experiments varied between 15 and 45% according to five predefined criteria. In median terms, relative effects (expressed as ratios between group means) were 60% larger in original experiments than in replications, while coefficients of variation were 60% smaller. Effect size decrease was smaller for MTT, cell line experiments, and original results with less variability, while t-values for replications were positively correlated with researcher predictions about replicability. Deviations from preregistered protocols were very common in replications, most frequently due to reasons inherent to the experimental model or related to infrastructure and logistics. Results are published as a preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.04.02.645026 and are currently undergoing revision and qualitative assessment by participant labs.

Conclusions
Replicability in our sample was limited, but within a range similar to that found in other replication projects. Protocol deviations, data management problems, and difficulties in describing methods were frequent in our replications. Our results highlight factors that limit the replicability of results published by researchers in Brazil and could be targeted to improve it.

The First GATE Report: Community Knowledge on Open Science and Artificial Intelligence

Mrs. Marie Alavi[1], *Prof. Julia Priess Buchheit*[1]
[1]*Kiel University, Kiel, Germany*

The Open Science Learning GATE (www.openscienceGATE.com) is a transparent, cooperative, and non-profit initiative designed to promote trustworthy research and quality-driven capacity building across the Open Science (OS) ecosystem. Through the GATE Service, data are continuously collected from a wide range of actors—including researchers, trainers, data stewards, funders, policymakers, and infrastructure providers—capturing their current guiding thoughts and practices on how OS is understood and implemented.
The GATE Reports transform this collective input into structured community knowledge. Each annual report synthesises, visualises, and reflects how the global research community defines and enacts OS in real time—while tracing its evolving relationship with Artificial Intelligence (AI). The reports provide a shared, evidence-based foundation for researchers, educators, and decision-makers to update their understanding, revise training materials, and align with emerging standards in responsible, transparent, and ethical research practices.
The first draft of the GATE Report, to be presented at WCRI2026, will present data collected throughout 2025. It highlights what the research community itself identifies as OS today, and how AI is being integrated, interpreted, and governed within these practices. While not preregistered, the report follows FAIR principles: all steps are transparently documented in the GATE Zenodo Community (https://zenodo.org/communities/nerq_os/records?q=&l=list&p=1&s=10&sort=newest), and nanopublications serve as modular, FAIR traceable building blocks of the dataset and analysis. By systematically capturing and sharing community knowledge on OS and AI, the GATE strengthens research integrity and enables an ongoing, evidence-based dialogue that supports responsible innovation and trustworthy research.

Art and Design Scholarship: Conflicting Research Integrities

Dr. Lois Klassen[1], ***Ms. Hillary Webb***[1]
[1]*Emily Carr University of Art + Design, Vancouver, Canada*

University-based research in the context of creative industry sectors presents unique challenges for research integrity training and standards. With funded research partnership opportunities in industrial design, AI development, and marketing sectors, students and researchers often face competing expectations: to meet scholarly expectations for ethics and conduct, while forwarding industry expectations for proprietary and monetary gains. Breaches in ethical conduct in industry often result in calls to improve ethics education in industrial design training programs (Warford, 2016). At Emily Carr University of Art and Design in Vancouver, Canada, ethics and conduct training has involved multi-disciplinary program development that includes research services staff, librarians, learning specialists, as well as instructors and academic supervisors (Klassen, Kampen, and Webb). This presentation is a practice summary that focuses on the research integrity tensions unique to art and design education with examples of mitigation strategies developed at Emily Carr University. These include: 1. A recognition of students' diverse positionality when industry research standards and academic research standards are in conflict; 2. Research integrity risks in industry sponsored work placements for graduate students in art and design; 3. Tensions over ownership and authorship when art production is combined with research and community partnerships; 4. Ethical tensions in design research training in the context of industries known for disinformation and exploitative methods.

References

Klassen, Lois, Andrea Kampen, and Hillary Webb. (In review). "Conducting Creative Research: Research Ethics and Research Conduct in Art and Design," Research Ethics,

Warford, Elisa L. 2016. "Ethics in the Classroom: The Volkswagen Diesel Scandal." Paper presented at 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition. https://peer.asee.org/ethics-in-the-classroom-the-volkswagen-diesel-scandal.

Towards a Research Security and Open Science Culture: A Pilot Study of the Four Spanish Public Technical Universities

Prof. Jesus Rodríguez-Pomeda[1,2], *Prof. Flor Sanchez-Fernandez*[1,2]
[1]*Universidad Autonoma De Madrid, Madrid, Spain,* [2]*INAECU (https://ror.org/004aqbt71), Getafe, Spain*

Objective
To Understand the Status of Research Security Culture Within the Implementation of Open Science in Europe, Based on an Examination of Spanish Public Universities Where a Greater Degree of Development Might Be Expected (I.E, Technical Universities), given Their Main Research Areas (Engineering, Computer Science, Etc.).

Methods
Development of a Research Security and Open Science Culture Model Based on a Literature Review, Considering the Latest Regulatory Developments in the European Union. Review of the Websites of the Four Universities Studied, Searching for Elements of the Model. Interviews (in Progress) with the Vice-rectors for Research to Compare the Results Obtained.

Results
The Universities Studied Show an Incipient Development of a Culture of Research Security and Open Science, Despite European Union Guidelines. An Integrated Model Consisting of 24 Elements Grouped into 14 Blocks Was Developed. Significant Progress Was Observed with Respect to Cybersecurity, as Well as the Absence of Crucial Elements of This Culture with Respect to Several Essential Blocks of the Model on the Websites of the Four Universities Studied (Top Management Support; Norms - Ethical Conduct; Security Training; Knowledge of Security; Risk Analysis and Assessment; Communication; Trust; Change Management - Attitude (Behavior); Open Science; Research Integrity; And Research Security; Fail Mitigation and Recovery; Research Security System). Specifically, the Most Advanced Situation Appears in the Element "Specific Guidelines and Directives Regarding Computer Security (Cybersecurity)" (Present in 75% of the Sample) in the Security Policy Block, as Well as with the Element "General University Policy Regarding Computer Security (Cybersecurity)" (Present in 50% of the Sample) in the Same Block, Followed by the Elements "Instrument to Assess the Level of Attention and Knowledge That Staff Have Regarding Research Security Culture" (Block of the Security Awareness Model) and "Comprehensive Approach to Regulatory Compliance" (Block of the Security Compliance Model), Both Appearing in 25% of the Sample.

Conclusion
Research Security Within the Framework of Open Science Does Not Appear to Be a Strategic Priority for the Universities Studied, as Indicated by the Limited Development of a Research Security Culture. Such a Culture Is Crucial to Ensuring Regulatory Compliance as Part of Academic Integrity.

Harnessing AI to Protect Peer Review Integrity. IOP Publishing's Duplicate Review Detector Tool

Mr. Eden Brent-Jones[1], ***Miss. Lauren Flintoft***[1], ***Mrs. Kim Eggleton***[1]
[1]*IOP Publishing, Bristol, United Kingdom*

Systematic attempts to undermine the peer review process are growing in both number and complexity across the industry. Often perpetrated by papermills and reviewer cartels, usually aided by AI, duplicate reviews are indicative of these efforts.(1,2) As unscrupulous actors increasingly seek to build fraudulent reviewer profiles, secure publication and inflate citation scores, harnessing AI to check the integrity of reports at scale is a necessary and effective solution.
Proprietary journal titles at IOP Publishing are managed by in-house professional editors. Further, these titles refrain from using recommended reviewers due to the increased risk of conflicts of interest. Even with these safeguards in place, review mills continue to exert their best efforts to undermine our checks and balances.
To combat this pressing issue, IOPP has developed a proprietary tool to scan and flag duplicate peer review reports. A non-generative AI embedding model is used to shortlist candidates with high semantic similarity, and a non-AI algorithm is then used for more granular text comparisons between these candidates. Users can search and filter by a multitude of factors, to aid investigations on specific reviewers and papers.
To date, the tool has processed over one million reviewer reports, checking all subsequent returned reviews against this repository. All data fed into the tool is handled securely, with no external sharing or processing by any generative AI tools, including large language models (LLMs).
The tool is calibrated to surface similarity levels starting from approximately 45%, ensuring it filters out reports that contain commonly used terms and phrases. False positives are further minimised by excluding short reports and certain article types. The remaining reports are manually assessed, allowing us to identify patterns that - without the intent of bad actors - would be highly improbable.
During this presentation, we will discuss the need for the tool, how it works and how we have implemented it within IOP Publishing.

1. Day, A. Exploratory analysis of text duplication in peer-review reveals peer-review fraud and paper mills. Scientometrics 127, 5965–5987 (2022).
2. https://www.chemistryworld.com/news/review-mills-identified-as-a-new-form-of-peer-review-fraud/4018888.article

When Should Questionable Research Practices Actually Be Questioned?

Dr. Daniele Fanelli[1]
[1]*Department of Research Methods and Practice, School of Social Sciences, Heriot-Watt University, United Kingdom*

This talk will present an analysis of the conditions that make Questionable Research Practices (QRP) most damaging to scientific progress, using the theoretical framework of Information Compression Theory (ICT). ICT quantifies the notion that scientific knowledge grows to the extent that it increases our ability to predict or explain phenomena and reduces the amount of information we need to do so. This analysis assumes two essential features of a QRP: that it potentially introduces bias in the results of a study and that it is not transparently reported. By fitting these assumptions into the ICT framework we identify three key properties of a study or field - i.e. the information yield, I, the bias, B, and the replicability, R. We thus derive a simple and general condition for the growth of knowledge: $IR > B$.
Applying this condition to the case in which a new study contributes to a field shows that the contribution will be negative to the extent that:
$IR(1 - i) > B(1 - b)$, in which i, b quantify the proportional impact that the study has on the field, and I, R, B are field conditions defining the "epistemic context" of the study QRP.
These variables can be estimated heuristically, and this talk will offer examples of how different types of QRPs may be more or less problematic depending on the characteristics of study and field.
This framework may have useful applications in metascientific research, in research integrity investigations, and in research policy-making.

Screening Crossref for Integrity Issues: Longitudinal Mining of Massive Publication Metadata

Mr. Jules Di Scala[1], *Prof. Guillaume Cabanac*[1,2], *Dr. Ophélie Fraisier-Vannier*[1], *Dr. Ronan Tournier*[3]
[1]*University of Toulouse, IRIT UMR 5505, Toulouse, France,* [2]*Institut universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France,* [3]*University Toulouse Capitole, IRIT UMR 5505, Toulouse, France*

Objective
Scientific articles are usually associated with a Digital Object Identifier (DOI). Most publishers request DOIs from Crossref, the largest registration agency that has minted 175 millions DOIs to date. The Crossref database stores the metadata of each scholarly work, including its title, authors, as well as references found in the bibliography. Recent research highlighted breaches in research integrity stemming from the misuse of Crossref by some publishers. Our team discovered and reported "sneaked references": references inserted in Crossref records despite not existing in the bibliography of articles (https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24896). This identification of manipulated metadata warrants a complete audit with longitudinal analysis of the Crossref dumps. However, auditing is challenging due to the evolving nature of these massive metadata.

Methods
We introduce an approach to store the complete snapshots that Crossref releases publicly monthly (2018-2025, 40-200GB per dump for a total of 64 TB). It aims to efficiently track the history of modifications. This approach is tailored for the analysis of slowly evolving data such as Crossref monthly snapshots, where changes are recorded monthly and affect only a small fraction of the records. We also introduce two indicators to detect potential misconduct: Concentration and Saturation. These metrics quantify the proportion of citations crediting a given author and a given journal, from the perspective of the author and the journal, respectively.

Results
Our approach outperforms state-of-the-art approaches in terms of storage capacity used. We illustrate the longitudinal screening of the metadata with the two indicators. We discovered and reported two such anomalies involving dishonest authors/journals gaming citation metrics. We also present interesting trends that our metrics captured about author–journal pairs, thereby highlighting how our contribution enables longitudinal analysis.

Conclusion
Longitudinal mining of monthly Crossref dumps and indicators enable spotting of anomalies in publisher-contributed metadata. We also release our code to ensure reproducibility and welcome third-party investigations.

Towards Detecting AI-Generated Manipulations in Academic Images

Bo Zhang[1], ***Tzu-Yen Ma***[1], ***Zixin Ding***[1], ***Zirui Wang***[1], *Feng Ling*[2], *Hongliang Hu*[2], *Xiaodong Qiao*[2], ***Prof. Haihong E***[1]
[1]*Beijing University of Post and Telecommunication, Beijing, China,* [2]*Beijing Wanfang Data Co., Ltd., Beijing, China*

Objective
With the rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (AIGC), the misuse of AI-generated images in academic publishing has raised serious concerns regarding authenticity and credibility. Generative models can produce highly realistic academic figures with fine-grained textures and semantically consistent content, making it increasingly difficult for traditional detection methods to distinguish genuine from forged images. This study develops a detection framework for AI-generated academic images, enabling accurate identification of various forgery types and providing reliable technical support for research integrity review and publication supervision.

Method & Results
We first constructed a dataset of more than 10k academic paper images, spanning 7 primary categories and 39 fine-grained subtypes, including charts, micrographs, medical imaging, schematic diagrams, and other types commonly found in scholarly publications. Four representative forgery strategies were designed (i.e. Text Constraint Fabrication, Image Inference Forgery, Targeted Region Restoration, and Targeted Region Editing) covering both global and local tampering patterns. Based on this dataset, we developed an advanced detection framework that leverages diffusion-based reconstruction and contrastive learning to enhance model sensitivity to generative traces and improve robustness and generalization across diverse forgery scenarios.

Experiments conducted on the constructed multi-source forgery dataset show that the proposed model achieves an average accuracy of 91.06% in overall detection tasks. It effectively identifies fine-grained generative traces and structural inconsistencies in representative forgery types. Under various perturbations such as JPEG compression, blurring, and scaling, the detection accuracy remains above 80%, demonstrating the robustness of the method in complex real-world environments.

Conclusion
This study establishes a detection framework for AI-generated forgeries in academic paper images, combining a multi-source generative forgery dataset with a diffusion-reconstruction-based contrastive learning strategy to achieve unified detection across diverse generation modes and image categories. Experimental results confirm that the proposed method effectively identifies AI-generated manipulations while maintaining high stability and generalization under complex conditions. The findings provide a feasible technical pathway for image authenticity verification in scholarly publishing and lay a foundation for building intelligent systems that support research-integrity governance and automated content auditing.

Retracted Randomized Controlled Trials Attributed to Super-Retractors and Top-Cited Scientists with Multiple Retractions: A Secondary Analysis of the VITALITY Cohort

*Ms. Minoo Matbouriahi[1], Mr. Chunwei Lyu[1], Dr. Florian Naudet[2,3], John Ioannidis[4,5,6,7], **Dr. Ioana Cristea**[1]*
[1]University of Padova, Department of General Psychology, Padova, Italy, [2]Université Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, Centre d'investigation clinique de Rennes (CIC1414), service de pharmacologie clinique, Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail (Irset), UMR S 1085, EHESP, 35000, Rennes, France, [3]Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France, [4]Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, United States, [5]Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, United States, [6]Department of Epidemiology & Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, United States, [7]Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, United States

Objective
Retracted randomized controlled trials (RCTs) contaminate the evidence ecosystem by distorting the findings of systematic reviews and meta-analyses, with downstream effects on clinical practice guidelines. We examine the contribution of authors with numerous retractions ("super-retractors") and top-cited authors with multiple retractions to the retracted clinical trial literature.

Methods
We conducted a secondary analysis of a previously published complete cohort of retracted RCTs (VITALITY; BMJ 2025). To identify super-retractors, we used the Retraction Watch (RW) Leaderboard (last update August 26th, 2025). We assembled a cohort of top-cited (over the last year and career-wise) scientists with ≥10 retractions from the 2025 update of science-wide standardized citation databases (Elsevier Data Repository, 2025 update: https://doi.org/10.17632/btchxktzyw.8). For each trial, we extracted publication/retraction year, time to retraction, and whether notices cited data concerns. Analyses were descriptive, as proportions and confidence intervals.

Results
On August 26th, 2025, the RW Leaderboard included 30 researchers. Six super-retractors in the fields of anesthesiology and bone diseases had co-authored 290 of 1,330 retracted RCTs (22%, 95% CI 20–24%). Of these, 52/290 (18%) involved more than one super-retractor. Eighteen career-long top-cited scientists with ≥10 retractions contributed to 327 retracted RCTs (25%, 95% CI 22–27%), of which 275 (84%) overlapped with super-retractors. Six single-year top-cited scientists contributed to 49 retracted RCTs (4%, 95% CI 3–5%), with 14 (29%) overlapping. Compared with trials without super-retractors, those co-authored by them were published earlier (median year 2000 [IQR 8] vs 2020 [8]) and retracted earlier (2013 [7] vs 2023 [4.5]), had a higher lag between publication and retraction (5,111 [3,260] vs 482 [789] days). The proportion of retractions citing data-related concerns was similar (69% vs 71%).

Conclusion
Six super-retractors account for one-fifth of retracted RCTs within two medical fields. Their work was published earlier and took longer to retract. Their higher citation counts might be confounded by time. However, we could only examine known super-retractors, and additional cases might have gone undetected. The disproportionate role of super-retractors, their interconnections, and the narrow concentration across two fields bias attempts to derive features of clinical trials with fabricated or manipulated data from collections of retracted RCTs.

International Research Trainees Understanding of Plagiarism and Integrity: A Qualitative Study

Mr. Bibek Dahal[1], ***Prof. Sarah Elaine Eaton***[1]
[1]*University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada*

Objective
The aim of this session is to present how research trainees from developing countries experience the variation of understanding plagiarism and its impact on their research integrity practices in Canadian universities.

Methods
In this transformative qualitative inquiry, data collected using semi-structured interviews from international research trainees in Canadian universities (N = 10). Participants were recruited through purposive sampling ensuring heterogeneity in terms of discipline, home country, and institution. We analysed data thematically, using Mezirow's (1997) transformative learning theory as an analytical framework.

Results
Our preliminary analysis revealed that international research trainees experienced plagiarism-centric anxiety, hampering their research integrity practices in Canadian universities. We found that plagiarism-centered integrity training in their home countries and their awareness about actions against misconduct in Canadian universities were contributed to diminished mental health. Due to the limited access to learning resources and a focus on 'copy and paste' using Turnitin in their home countries, they found idea of stealing and self-plagiarism were novel concepts within plagiarism. The majority of participants reported that they become aware of self-plagiarism when they were accused of misconduct in Canadian universities. Penalizing their involvement in self-plagiarism and other misconduct without adequate education was viewed as an injustice. In addition to these preliminary findings, we share our complete analysis highlighting how international research trainees in Canada experience their transformative learning of the concepts related to plagiarism and research integrity.

Conclusion
Unlike cultural differences in understanding research misconduct, plagiarism-centered training has become a critical cause for worsening international research trainees' mental health. Taking such insight at the center, educators at Canadian universities could consider education first approach before reporting misconduct. Due to the small sample, findings may not represent all universities.

3.E - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM

An Evaluation of Institutional Mechanisms for Reporting and Responding to Research Misconduct in Nigerian Universities

Ms. Cynthia Komolafe[1], *Dr. Olayinka Eyelade*[1], *Prof. Clement Adebamowo*[2]
[1]*Department Of Bioethics and Medical Humanities, Faculty of Multidisciplinary Study, UI, Ibadan. Nigeria, Ibadan, Nigeria,* [2]*Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine (UMSOM), Maryland, USA*

Objective
Research misconduct undermines scientific integrity and public trust in academia. While several high-income countries have established comprehensive frameworks for reporting and responding to misconduct, low- and middle-income countries such as Nigeria face significant gaps in institutional mechanisms and policy implementation. This study evaluated institutional policies, reporting pathways, investigative processes, whistleblower protection, and enforcement mechanisms for research misconduct in Nigerian universities.

Methods
A qualitative exploratory design was adopted. Fifteen key informant interviews were conducted with Research Management Office personnel, ethics committee members, and senior academics across three purposively selected Nigerian universities. Interviews were semi-structured, audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed thematically using an inductive coding approach.

Results
Findings reveal that although research policies exist, mechanisms for reporting and responding to misconduct are poorly publicized, inconsistently applied, and underutilized. Most respondents reported a reliance on informal reporting channels due to limited awareness and fear of retaliation. Whistleblower protection measures were found to be inadequate and inconsistently implemented, discouraging transparency. Investigative processes were largely committee-driven but lacked standardized timelines, resulting in significant delays. Sanctions for misconduct varied widely across institutions, ranging from verbal warnings to dismissal, with no consistent enforcement framework.

Conclusion
Institutional mechanisms for addressing research misconduct in Nigerian universities remain fragmented and insufficient, creating gaps in policy enforcement, whistleblower protection, and reporting transparency. Strengthening institutional frameworks through mandatory research integrity training, establishing research integrity offices, confidential reporting systems, clear investigative timelines, and standardized sanctioning policies is critical to fostering a culture of responsible conduct of research (RCR). These findings have implications for institutional governance and global efforts to uphold research integrity in low-resource academic settings.

Keywords: Research misconduct, Institutional mechanisms, Research integrity, Whistleblower protection, Nigerian universities, Responsible conduct of research.

Science Under Attack: Defending Scientific Integrity in a Polarized World

Dr. Tiffany Chenneville[1]
[1]*University of South Florida, St. Petersburg, USA*

In an era when political influence, censorship, and misinformation increasingly shape scientific discourse, maintaining scientific integrity has become a global challenge. The politicization of science threatens inclusivity, objectivity, transparency, and ethical conduct—core values that sustain public trust and international collaboration. Drawing on experiences as a science and technology policy fellow in both legislative and executive branches of government in the United States during a time of administrative upheaval, this presentation examines how these pressures manifest within policy-making contexts and how lessons from such environments can inform global efforts to safeguard research integrity.

At the intersection of science and governance, scientists face ethical responsibilities to communicate findings with rigor, clarity, and independence, even when evidence conflicts with ideological or partisan narratives. Policymakers, in turn, carry a reciprocal obligation to use scientific input as the basis for equitable and evidence-informed decision-making rather than as a political instrument. When these mutual responsibilities break down, the credibility of science—and the policies derived from it—erodes, with consequences that reverberate far beyond national borders.

Governments and institutions worldwide encounter similar vulnerabilities: external pressure on researchers, suppression of inconvenient results, and erosion of transparency and accountability mechanisms. These forces not only distort scientific discourse but also weaken the global scientific community's capacity to respond to shared challenges such as climate change, health crises, and technological governance.

This presentation will explore real-world examples of how misinformation, ideological agendas, and institutional pressures undermine trust in science. It will also highlight strategies to strengthen resilience in research systems through policy safeguards, ethical leadership, and international collaboration. The central argument is that defending scientific integrity in a politicized world requires global reciprocity: a shared commitment among scientists, policymakers, and the public to protect the independence, inclusivity, and transparency of scientific inquiry. Only by reaffirming these principles can science continue to serve humanity as a reliable foundation for progress, justice, and the public good.

Navigating Authorship Disputes and "Idea Plagiarism": Challenges and Proactive Strategies to Promote Constructive Collaboration

Mr. Minal Caron[1], *Dr. Lisa Rasmussen*
[1]*Ropes and Gray LLP, Boston, USA*

Plagiarism in academic research has emerged as a high-profile issue frequently covered by the press. Research institutions are increasingly in the position of adjudicating complex disputes involving questions about the definition of plagiarism that cannot be answered by looking to the limited guidance made available by government agencies (for example, the HHS Office of Research Integrity in the United States), journals, and other sources. Many of these difficult scenarios involve the same underlying premise: a claim that a researcher has used another researcher's ideas without providing appropriate credit to the other researcher. Institutions are increasingly in the position of deciding whether these claims should be deemed as plagiarism allegations that must be reviewed pursuant to their research misconduct policies, or instead viewed as authorship or credit disputes that do not require initiation of a research misconduct proceeding, with no consensus view about how these issues should be resolved.

This presentation will discuss these challenges and offer proactive strategies to reduce risk of disputes and promote positive and open conversations about research credit and authorship. First, we will review several examples of complex scenarios that sometimes fall under the rubric of plagiarism. Examples include (1) the line between plagiarism of another's ideas and authorship disputes, (2) conducting independent research only after learning that another researcher was undertaking the same work and failing to acknowledge the other researcher's work, and (3) re-use of one's own previously published work without acknowledging the prior work. Next, we will discuss potential frameworks that could help institutions work toward a consensus definition of "idea plagiarism" that allows for fair and equitable application across cases. Finally, we will review proactive strategies that institutions can deploy to reduce the likelihood that disputes about credit and attribution will result in plagiarism allegations and reputational harm. We will provide examples of policies and practices implemented by institutions and will summarize the scholarly work of one of the presenters, a research ethicist who serves as the principal investigator of project focused on developing institutional authorship policies and agreements and evaluating the impact of these tools.

BEYOND Guidelines for Preventing and Addressing Research Misconduct

*Mrs. Keziah Chanyisa Khayadi Dash[1], **Prof. Rosemarie De La Cruz Bernabe**[1], **Ms. Pooja Aryal**[1], **Dr. Vivian Mbanya**[1]*
[1]University of Oslo, OSLO, Norway

Objective
The objective is to enhance institutional governance in Research Ethics (RE) and Research Integrity (RI) through the BEYOND guidelines. These guidelines allocate specific RE/RI responsibilities to various stakeholders, such as Research Performing Organizations (RPOs), Research Funding Organizations (RFOs), researchers, RE/RI bodies, and policymakers. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the rehabilitation and reintegration of researchers, promoting mental health and well-being, ensuring gender equality, and preventing discrimination and harassment.

Methods
A thematic analysis of the BEYOND project deliverables and milestones was conducted. Using NVivo software, all documents were coded into thematic categories, which subsequently informed the development of the guidelines.

Results
The guidelines present key findings organised into three main areas:

Terminology and Conceptual Framework:
A glossary of key terms was developed, including the introduction of a new concept: Contestable Research Practices (CRPs). CRPs refer to research behaviors whose ethicality depends on disciplinary or methodological context. The guidelines distinguish CRPs from universally questionable practices, recognising that not all ethically debatable actions constitute research misconduct.

Preventing and Addressing Research Misconduct (RM)
This section explores the broader implications of RM, including its socio-economic consequences, impact on researchers' mental health and well-being, and its effect on public trust in science. Recommendations for managing RM address political sensitivity and strategies to protect trust, rehabilitation and reintegration of researchers' post-misconduct, whistleblower protections and consultation mechanisms, as well as the use of nudges—subtle, non-coercive changes to the research environment that promote ethical decision-making—to raise awareness around RM and CRPs.

Research Integrity and Ethics Education and Training
The final section focuses on fostering ethical behaviour through comprehensive training. It emphasises building knowledge, skills, values, and habits that enable researchers to self-regulate, particularly in areas vulnerable to ethical lapses (e.g., selective data analysis). The guidelines advocate for the use of innovative pedagogical tools and underscore the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of RE/RI training programs.

Conclusion
The guidelines will be updated at least every five years to address any gaps left out in addressing and preventing research misconduct.

Ethics Review in the Age of Emerging Technologies: A Scoping Review and Evidence and Gap Map

*Dr. Antonija Mijatović[1], Lana Barac, Dr. Luciano D'Andrea, Nevien Kirk, Marina Markellou, Jonas Pfister, Thomas Raucheger, Dr. Marjo Rauhala, Ljupco Risteki, Tade Matthias Spranger, Dr. Constantin Vică, Hella von Unger, Dr. Alexandra Zorilă, **Miss Barbara Ćaćić**, Prof. Ana Marušić*
[1]University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia

Objective
This study offers a comprehensive overview of challenges facing research ethics review processes in the evolving research environments. Its objective was to identify key ethical issues, evaluate how current review systems address these challenges, and provide evidence-based recommendations for enhancing ethics governance.

Methods
We conducted a scoping review of 756 academic articles and 78 EU-funded project deliverables (2014–2024), following the Campbell Collaboration and Joanna Briggs Institute frameworks. Using AI-assisted text mining and manual verification, we identified key ethical challenges linked to relevant technologies. The results were synthesized into an evidence and gap map (EGM). In addition, we identified several challenges that were specific to Research Ethics Committees (RECs).

Results
We identified 18 major ethical challenges across 9 technology domains. Artificial intelligence and biomedical engineering were the most common topics, particularly concerning privacy, fairness, accountability, and transparency. Underexplored areas included anonymization, commercialization, equity, and public trust, especially in big data and Internet of Things research. The EGM visualizes these gaps, highlighting domains where ethical and regulatory oversight remains limited. We also identified persistent barriers for RECs, which included limited training and resources, lack of technical expertise, fragmented and outdated regulatory frameworks, and inconsistencies in review processes across institutions and jurisdictions. Facilitators included continuous training and capacity-building for REC members, harmonized regulatory standards, flexible consent mechanisms, and community engagement.

Conclusion
Ethics review systems struggle to keep up with rapid technological advancements. Our results indicate the need for harmonized, technology-specific, and interdisciplinary review processes. The evidence and gap map provides an open resource to direct future policy development and enhance ethics review capacity in evolving research environments.

Keywords: Research ethics review, emerging technologies, evidence and gap map, AI, scoping review, regulatory governance

Understanding the Gaps and Challenges in Research Integrity and Compliance in India through a Nationwide Survey

Dr. Sabuj Bhattacharyya[1], *Ms Sebanti Tewary*[1], *Dr Saloni Bhatia*[2], *Dr Ketan Thorat*[1]
[1]*BRIC-Institute For Stem Cell Science and Regenerative Medicine, Bangalore, India,* [2]*Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE), Bangalore, India*

Research integrity and compliance are essential to ensure reproducibility and accountability in modern scientific research. In India, academic and research regulatory bodies have developed detailed policies to address issues related to research integrity and compliance. However, due to the digital divide and unequal access to resources, implementation varies widely across institutions. Moreover, the challenges faced by Indian academics are often under-documented, limiting effective interventions and increasing the risk of research misconduct or lapses in compliance.
To explore the gaps and challenges in academic integrity and regulatory compliance across life science institutes in India, we conducted a nationwide, anonymised, semi-structured online questionnaire survey in 2024. The survey targeted senior faculty members and institutional leadership, and collected information about demography (e.g., career stage, type of institute, geographic location), current practices in integrity and compliance (e.g., presence of a dedicated office, frequency of training), and the top challenges faced.
Responses were obtained from 164 Indian academic organisations, with most respondents having over 20 years of experience in academia. About 42.26% of responses came from Tier-1 or large cities, primarily in the southern and northern regions. Findings revealed the presence of research ethics offices, ethics committees, and regular training programs on research integrity in several institutions. While 92% of respondents reported access to plagiarism detection tools, only 24% had access to image integrity checking software. Respondents from government-funded research institutes and state universities particularly highlighted gaps such as the absence of dedicated ethics offices, lack of image integrity tools, infrequent training activities, and limited institutional policies. Across all institutions, the most frequently cited challenges were the unavailability of resources (34%), inadequate infrastructure (27%), and lack of awareness (24%). These insights reflect systemic barriers to establishing a strong and sustainable culture of research integrity in India.
The survey not only provided an overview of the current state of academic integrity and regulatory compliance across state, central, private, and non-government institutions, but also identified priority areas for improvement. Notably, a low response rate from geographically remote areas and difficulties in cross-verifying some responses with the responders' institution website emerged as key limitations of the study.

3.F - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM

The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Peer Review: Legal and Ethical Frameworks for Research Integrity

Dr. Sonja Ochsenfeld-Repp[1], *Martin Steinberger*[1]
[1]*German Research Foundation, Bonn, Germany*

Advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) and its potential applications in research assessment, coupled with the growing challenge for research funding organizations (RFOs) to recruit reviewers, raise fundamental legal and ethical questions regarding peer review and research integrity. Although AI can provide technical support and improve efficiency, it must be used in a way that preserves the human-centered nature of peer review, while also ensuring research integrity, confidentiality, legal compliance and institutional trust. Any regulatory approach must respect the responsibilities of reviewers, safeguard the rights of applicants, comply with legal requirements (including data protection and copyright laws) and AI-related legal regulations, and align with the obligations of RFOs.

An approach to the responsible use of AI in peer review must be based on compliance with clearly defined guidelines. For example, this could involve using commercial systems on the condition that proposal data is not used for training purposes. Reviewers would remain fully responsible for the content of the review, and this responsibility could not be delegated to AI. They would also need to be sufficiently competent to use AI systems in an informed manner. In line with good research practice, reviewers would be required to disclose any use of AI in their reviews. Transparent communication would protect applicants´ rights, for instance by providing general data protection notices from RFOs and by indicating in review reports the purposes for which AI was used. Additionally, applicants may need to consent to the use of their proposal information in AI systems for copyright reasons. Overall, such an approach could provide reviewers with guidance, protect applicants´ legitimate interests, strengthen accountability and trust, and help RFOs fulfil their legal and reputational obligations.

This oral presentation will outline fundamental legal and ethical considerations and present possible approaches to the use of AI in peer review. These approaches may serve as examples of how RFOs can enable the timely use of AI, thereby contributing to broader international discussions at the interface of research integrity and assessment.

Streamlined Research Ethics Review Process: Understanding Turnaround Time, Concerns, and Challenges in University-Based Research Ethics Committees

Dr. Florence Navidad[1]
[1]*University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines*

Objectives
Research involving human participants must undergo an ethics review, but the lengthy process can slow down socially beneficial work. This study aimed to enhance the efficiency of the ethics review process by examining turnaround times and challenges faced by different Research Ethics Committees within a university.

Methods
The Research Ethics Activity Model employs a triangulation method combining quantitative and qualitative approaches across four university-based Research Ethics Committees (RECs). Quantitative retrospective data and qualitative insights from key informants (REC officers) on the unit's ethical review procedures were analyzed using descriptive statistics and thematic analysis.

Results
The findings aim to enhance the research ethics review process while ensuring the respondents' well-being is not compromised. The informants indicated that the duration of the ethics review process varies significantly, primarily depending on the availability of reviewers and the content sensitivity of specific research protocols. While institutions emphasize a consistent ethics review process and commitment to ethical standards that begin with verifying the completeness of the submission requirements, which is usually handled by the office secretariat, who ensures that all necessary documents are included, they also express concerns about challenges RECs face, such as a surge of reviews, shortages of human resources, and the need for diverse expertise. The diverse topics submitted require specialists, yet many reviewers are faculty members burdened with other academic duties. This limitation reduces their ability to thoroughly review protocols, especially when the volume of requests increases, leading to a backlog that complicates the process. To address these issues and challenges, informants recommend improving electronic processes, collaborating more effectively with research coordinators, and providing research ethics orientation for students and faculty members. It is also suggested that workloads be aligned, and increased contributions should be encouraged and incentivized for reviewers.

Conclusion
The findings highlight the importance of transparency, communication, and planning in managing the variability of ethics review timelines. Proactive strategies, such as adopting electronic processes, encouraging collaboration, motivating reviewers, and building capacity, can help Research Ethics Committees (RECs) enhance efficiency, quality, and compliance, thus supporting high-quality research.

A Crossroad for Artificial Intelligence and African Ubuntu Philosophy: Examining Research Integrity through the Lens of Ubuntu Among Researchers in Botswana-Africa

Dr. Ayodeji Michael Obadire[1], *Ms Ludo Kgamule*[1], *Dr. Tebogo Magang*[1], *Dr Changu Batisani*[2], *Dr. Kelebogile Kenalemang*[1]
[1]*Botswana Accountancy College, Gaborone, Botswana,* [2]*Botswana Open University, Gaborone, Botswana*

Objective
This study critically examined the implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies on research integrity and the African Ubuntu Philosophy among researchers in Botswana. It assessed both the potential risks and opportunities associated with AI adoption and recommended a suitable framework to promote its responsible use.

Methods
The study employed a qualitative research design within an interpretivist paradigm, sampling six of ten registered Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Botswana. Data was collected from 21 participants using semi-structured interviews to capture in-depth experiences and perceptions. ATLAS.ti was used for thematic analysis, enabling systematic identification and interpretation of emerging themes.

Results
Participants highlighted that a key benefit of AI is improved access to knowledge, enabling Botswana researchers who often face challenges in reaching global resources to overcome these systemic barriers and gain timely access to relevant information. Other benefits include streamlined literature searches, data analysis, academic writing, preservation of indigenous knowledge, and improved research efficiency.

However, participants expressed concerns that AI poses significant risks to research integrity and Ubuntu. Key risks include promoting plagiarism, reducing critical thinking, originality, and the human touch, and fostering data fabrication and biases that undermine honesty and responsibility. In the context of Ubuntu, AI was perceived to erode equality, community values, and local knowledge, particularly in marginalised contexts, potentially compromising respect and integrity. Participants alluded that uncritical adoption of AI, largely developed in Western contexts, may perpetuate epistemic colonialism, overshadowing African knowledge, diminishing fairness, solidarity, and the human-centered values central to Ubuntu.

To aligns AI adoption with local cultural and ethical principles and remedy the risks of AI eroding research integrity and African Ubuntu philosophy, the study proposes several recommendations under key themes including embedding clear ethical guidelines, human accountability, transparency, defined AI scope, equitable access, training, collaborative research culture to eliminate bias and continuous monitoring.

Conclusion
This study is limited to Botswana, with the exclusion of other Ubuntu revered African nations. This study reveals that while AI offers significant benefits, it poses systemic risks to research integrity and African Ubuntu philosophy, highlighting the urgent need for implementing a comprehensive framework to guide responsible use of AI.

Ethics of Indigenous Knowledge Use in Urban Environmental Research in South Asia

Dr. Kasphia Nahrin[1]
[1]*Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh*

Objective
The ethical inclusion of Indigenous and Local knowledge (ILK) in urban environmental research is very significant for ensuring research integrity. The ethical use of ILK remains unexplored in research related to South Asian countries, where rapid urbanization affects the ecological systems harmfully. This study aims to examine how ILK is utilized, credited, and reported in urban environmental research across South Asian countries during the last decade (2014-2024). This evaluates and recommends the ethical recognitions utilizing the principles of prior informed consent (PIC), co-authorship of indigenous representatives, acknowledgement of contributions, and benefit-sharing practices.

Method
The study adopts a mixed and empirical approach—both quantitative and qualitative. The study is conducting a PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) analysis of peer-reviewed articles using Scopus, Google Scholar, Web of Science, and policy documents. The urban environmental research related to India, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka is being identified and analyzed through descriptive statistics, temporal trends, and qualitative content analysis.

Findings
The qualitative results through content analysis indicate that ILK is frequently referenced and seldom integrated as an equal epistemological framework. The ethical engagement practices are inconsistently reported, such as PIC and indigenous participation in authorship. Many studies treat indigenous insights as data rather than co-produced knowledge, revealing significant ethical and epistemic gaps. The quantitative analysis through the descriptive statistics and temporal trend will be completed before the WCRI 2026 conference, and the final validated findings will be presented there.

Conclusion
The preliminary findings of the study highlight critical shortcomings in the ethically governed research in the Global South. The contribution of this study is to guide the urban research policy of strengthening the equitable collaboration, data sovereignty, and respectful engagement with the indigenous and local communities. This research is original in its regional focus on urban settings and systematic quantification of the ethical recognition principles of urban environmental research.
Keywords: Indigenous Knowledge Systems, Research Integrity, Urban Environment, South Asia, Data Sovereignty.

Sustaining Research Integrity Offices (RIOs) in Lower Middle-Income Countries: A Three-Year Evaluation of the Moi University RIO, Kenya.

Dr. Edwin Onyango Were[1], *Dr. Jepchirchir Kiplagat*[2], *Ms. Eunice Kaguiri*[3], *Ms Brigid Koskei*[4], *Dr. Ann Mwangi*[4,5]

[1]*Department of Reproductive Health, Moi University, Eldoret., Eldoret, Kenya,* [2]*Department of Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya,* [3]*AMPATH Research Program, Moi University, Kenya, Eldoret, Kenya,* [4]*DVC Academics, Moi University, Kenya, Eldoret, Kenya,* [5]*Department of Mathematics, Physics and Computing, Moi University, Kenya, Eldoret, Kenya*

Background
Research Integrity Offices (RIOs) oversee institutional research integrity, much like institutional review boards provide ethics review for scientific proposals. However, RIOs remain rare in the lower- and middle-income countries (LMICs). We previously documented the establishment and launch of Moi University RIO (MURIO), the first of its kind in Kenya, following baseline assessments, benchmarking, policy integration, and institutional support. This process culminated in Moi University's RIO official launch by the Vice Chancellor in April 2022.

Objective
Evaluate the sustainability of the MURIO, three years after its inception and launch.

Methods
We conducted a retrospective evaluation of MURIO activities from April 2022 to July 2025. Data sources included official progress reports, activity records, documentation on policy implementation status, records of institutional support mechanisms and unstructured interview with the MURIO administrator. We systematically compared planned versus implemented activities and conducted an analysis to identify operational challenges during the evaluation period.

Results
Despite policy integration, MURIO conducted only one awareness training for postgraduate students in November 2022. A training planned for Deans and the Senate in 2025 was cancelled due to funding constraints. The Institutional Research Ethics Committee has reported three cases of suspected research misconduct including a questionable research practice, suspected plagiarism and a protocol violation. All cases remain under review with no resolution to date. Operational challenges involve not implementing the Academic and Research Integrity Policy, failure to constitute the research misconduct committees, inadequate funding for RIO activities, and shortage of trained staff.

Lessons Learned
Sustainable RIO function requires enduring institutional commitment beyond initial policy integration and launch. Securing sustained funding for RIO operations, constituting functional governance structures (misconduct committees), developing staff competencies through targeted training, implementing systematic policy roll-out mechanisms, and creating accountability frameworks are critical.

Conclusion
Institutions in the LMICs seeking to establish functional RIOs must address fundamental institutional capacity gaps including governance structures, funding mechanisms, and human resource development.

3.G - Oral Session

May 4, 2026, 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM

Corrections and Retractions: Upgrading the Scientific Record, a Consensus Study of the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine

Dr. Karla Hagan[1]
[1]*National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, And Medicine, Washington, USA*

This presentation will discuss the U.S. National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine Consensus Study on 'Corrections and Retractions: Upgrading the Scientific Record.' The advancement of scientific knowledge relies on the accuracy of the findings reported in the scientific literature. Ideally, when errors are identified in a published article, corrections would be quickly and transparently addressed and resolved. This consensus study will recommend improvements to the processes used to correct errors in scientific articles. The study committee is comprised of thirteen experts who offer a range of viewpoints and experience. The study will examine international practices, as the scientific research enterprise is global.

The committee will:
1) Review and summarize current international practices and guidelines for correcting the scientific literature by outlining the types of institutions and entities, rules and regulations, and actions involved in the process of identifying, correcting, and, if necessary, retracting a scientific article;
2) Identify incentive structures for institutions and entities that could result in higher quality publications including self-correction and timely correction of published and pre-published literature; and
3) Propose mechanisms, criteria, and standards to improve the timelines, notifications, transparency, and consistency of corrections to scientific publications.

The committee will issue a consensus report with findings and recommendations in spring 2026.

Testing Computational Reproducibility Review in Editorial Workflows of Academic Journals: Preliminary Results from a Randomized Controlled Trial Within the European iRISE Project

Dr. Laura Caquelin[1], *Rachel Heyard*[2], *Stephanie Zellers*[3], *Hanno Würbel*[4], *Gustav Nilsonne*[1]
[1]*Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,* [2]*Center for Reproducible Science at the Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland,* [3]*Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland,* [4]*Division of Animal Welfare, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland*

Objective
Computational reproducibility is vital to research quality but rarely assessed systematically. This study aims to evaluate whether Computational Reproducibility Review (CRR) during the publication process improves reproducibility compared to standard peer review. We hypothesize that this intervention will improve reproducibility, encourage code sharing, and reduce errors.

Method
This randomized controlled trial enrolls manuscripts submitted to partnering journals that meet inclusion criteria, including open data availability and inferential analysis. Manuscripts are randomized (1:1) to either peer review with CRR (intervention group) or standard peer review without intervention (control group). The CRR involves reproducing the essential statistical results using shared data (with or without the analysis code). Feedback is provided to authors in the intervention group during the peer review. Computational reproducibility of the control group will be assessed only after publication. The primary outcome is the difference, between CRR versus control, in the proportion of manuscripts of which we successfully reproduced the essential statistical results after publication. Secondary outcomes include rates of code sharing, overt errors identified, time required for the review, publication timelines, and categorized reproducibility issues.

Results
The study protocol was preregistered on the Open Science Framework [1]. Enrollment of manuscripts commenced in January 2025 and is ongoing. As of September 2025, 73 manuscripts submitted to GigaSicence, BDJ or RIO journal have been screened. Of these, 35 were eligible and 33 have been randomized. Sixteen manuscripts were randomized to the intervention group, of which 3 were rejected after the first round of review. Two from the intervention group and none of the 18 manuscripts randomized from the control group have been published. Early findings show that CRRs often require direct communication with authors to clarify or complete missing information or materials. The median time spent on the first round of CRR was 8.75 hours (IQR: 5.79–13.73) per manuscript. The project is expected to run until March 2026.

Conclusion
This study fills an important gap in assessing research quality by testing a practical way to improve computational reproducibility. If successful, the results could support wider use of CRR in academic journals, leading to more reliable and trustworthy science.

[1]doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/3Y8FP

Open Science Checklist to Improve Reproducibility in Biomedical Journals: A Randomised Controlled Trial

Ms. Ayu Putu Madri Dewi[1], *Dr. Melissa Rethlefsen*[2], *Sara Schroter*[3,4], *Dr. Florian Naudet*[5,6], *Dr. Nicholas DeVito*[7], *Constant Vinatier*[5], *Dr. Inge Stegeman*[8,9], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[1], *Dr. Gowri Gopalakrishna*[1,10]
[1]*Amsterdam UMC, Epidemiology and Data Science Department, Amsterdam, The Netherlands,* [2]*Health Sciences Library and Informatics Center, University of New Mexico, , USA,* [3]*BMJ Publishing Group, London, UK,* [4]*Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK,* [5]*Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) - UMR_S 1085, F-35000 , , France,* [6]*Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France,* [7]*Bennett Institute for Applied Data Science, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK,* [8]*Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head & Neck Surgery University Medical Center , Utrecht, The Netherlands,* [9]*Brain Center, University Medical Center , Utrecht, The Netherlands,* [10]*Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands*

Objective
To assess whether using an open science checklist during the peer review process in biomedical journals improves the reproducibility of scientific findings.

Methods
This study is registered, and its protocol is available on the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/b5g6y/). We conducted a parallel, two-arm, equal allocation, randomised controlled trial using block randomisation in The BMJ and BMJ Open. We included biomedical manuscripts with quantitative, observational, or experimental designs, including systematic reviews with meta-analysis, and excluded narrative reviews, opinion papers, study protocols, qualitative studies, and commentaries. In the intervention arm, an open science checklist was applied during peer review, and a standardised feedback letter was sent to the authors. In the control arm, no open science checks were performed. The primary outcome was reproducibility, assessed by reproducing the primary findings using the same data and analysis methods, and the secondary outcome was the availability of data and code. Both outcomes were assessed by four blinded outcome assessors at the first revision stage.

Results
From 3 March to 18 April 2025, a total of 402 manuscripts were randomised with 201 in the intervention arm and 201 in the control arm. As of 9 October 2025, 152 manuscripts were revised and resubmitted. Of these, 60 were fully assessed for data, code, and reproducibility. Seventeen manuscripts shared data or code, and one manuscript was fully reproducible. Data analysis is ongoing, and final results will be available before May 2026.

Conclusion
Applying open science checks during peer review is feasible and can be implemented without disrupting editorial workflows. Preliminary findings indicate that while some authors responded by sharing data or code, overall reproducibility remains very low. This highlights that simply prompting open science practices during peer review may not be sufficient to ensure reproducible research. Further analyses will determine whether the intervention improves transparency (through actual data and code availability checking) and reproducibility compared with the control arm. These results will help journals evaluate whether integrating structured open science checks in peer review can strengthen reproducibility of published research.

Trust Indicators Research: A Mixed Method Study

Dr. Ilaria Cianchetta[1], *Mrs. Theba Marando*[2], *Miss Nicola Mansell*[2], *Dr. Laura Schmidt*[1], *Adrian Mulligan*[2]
[1]*Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands,* [2]*Elsevier, London, United Kingdom*

Objective
Trust indicators, or trust markers, are signals of transparency, reproducibility, and integrity that complement research articles to provide additional context aimed at increasing the perception of trustworthiness of the published paper. We will present research on the most effective trust indicators for readers of published scientific articles.

Methods
Mixed qualitative and quantitative method with 14 in-depth interviews and a large-scale survey involving 1274 respondents. Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which a particular trust marker affects their trust in published content on a Likert scale from “significantly decreases my trust” to “significantly increases my trust”, with “no change” as the midpoint.

Results
Trust in published articles is not built on a single factor but emerges from a combination of information. To assess the trustworthiness of articles, researchers look at peer review, the methodology, at any disclosed conflict of interest, and at the presence of information that refer to the reproducibility of the article, such as accessible original data and code. Traditional quantitative metrics such as the journal’s impact factor, author h-index or downloads and views are taken into consideration, but fear of manipulation makes this data less reliable to evaluate the credibility of published research. While Generative AI is routinely used for editing and grammar checks, its use for generating content is considered risky and the lack of disclosures diminishes the perception of trustworthiness in published research. Peer review is largely considered as the primary mechanism to detect fraud or unreliable research, and readers would like to see more transparency on the process and the reviewers’ reports to assess the results and the publication process and to avoid falling victims of predatory journals.

Conclusion
The rise in generative AI, retractions due to ethical reasons and publication malpractice, such as paper mills and predatory journals, have shone a spotlight on issues affecting the integrity of published content. Publishers should consider surfacing information and increase transparency in the publication process alongside the published articles, to help readers evaluate the credibility of research papers.

Research Integrity for Reviewed Preprints

Mr Wei Mun Chan[1]
[1]*eLife Sciences Publications Ltd, Cambridge, United Kingdom*

In eLife's publishing model, every article we review is published as a Reviewed Preprint. This is a type of scientific publication that includes the article, feedback from the reviewers, a response from the author (if available), and an eLife Assessment that summarises the significance of the findings being reported and the strength of the evidence. By making the peer review process transparent, readers have access to expert evaluations and can better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the study.

In addition to rigorous peer review, Reviewed Preprints go through pre-publication checks to ensure they meet expected standards for integrity and ethics. We present an overview of our research integrity checks. This includes checking for image integrity, plagiarism, ethics, data, software and materials availability. We then present the extra checks we introduced between March and September 2025. Firstly, we report the integration of SciScore (SciCrunch, Inc), a methods review tool we make available to authors to help them improve methods reporting in their work. Secondly, we look at the implementation of the PaperPal Preflight tool (Cactus Communications), a tool which uses artificial intelligence to identify issues affecting the scientific integrity of papers. We report key observations from using both tools for a six-month period. We conclude with a discussion of further refinements we can make to further improve the rigor, ethics and integrity of what we publish.

Rates of Error Corrections for Cancer Research Publications in two High Impact Factor Journals

Mr. Pranujan Pathmendra, ***Prof. Jennifer Byrne***[1]
[1]*University Of Sydney, Camperdown, Australia*

Objective
Science is presumed to be self-correcting, but our team has observed low rates of published corrections to cancer research publications with experimental reagent errors. We examined whether editorial communications and posts to the online post-publication commentary platform PubPeer contribute to published corrections of reagent errors in articles in two high impact factor cancer research journals, Molecular Cancer and Oncogene.

Methods
We studied responses to nucleotide sequence reagent errors in original articles in Molecular Cancer (articles published in 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020) and Oncogene (non-coding RNA articles published in 2020). Reagent errors were described in a preprint that was first shared with journal editors by email in February 2023. We then wrote standardized, signed PubPeer notices describing reagent errors in each article. Articles were ranked according to PubMed identifiers and assigned to one of 2 groups using alternate PubMed identifiers. PubPeer notices for 53 and 52 articles were allocated to groups 1 and 2, respectively, and posted on 5 April 2023 (group 1 notices) and 4 October 2023 (group 2 notices). Author responses and post-publication corrections were monitored from April 2023-July 2024.

Results
Most PubPeer posts (group 1: 38/53, 72%; group 2: 41/52, 79%) did not receive author responses during the study period. Of the 28% (15/53) group 1 papers and 21% (11/52) group 2 papers that received author response(s) to our PubPeer posts, most (20/26, 77%) authors responded within one month of the post, and most (16/26, 62%) accepted at least one claimed error. The authors of 10/105 (9.5%) articles declared their intent to seek a published correction, yet none of these 10 papers had been corrected by the end of the study period. A small minority (7/105, 6.7%) of papers received post-publication correction notices during the study period, where only 3 notices addressed errors that we queried.

Conclusion
This study describes low rates of author engagement with PubPeer posts, and marginal rates of corrections by two high impact factor cancer research journals in response to direct editor communications and PubPeer posts. Our results highlight the need for more efficient post-publication correction processes to support pre-clinical cancer research.

Reimagining Research Integrity: Findings from the BEYOND Project's Public Consultation

Dr. Signe Mežinska[1], *Ms. Elīza Dubovska*[1]
[1]*University Of Latvia, Riga, Latvia*

Objective
This presentation will include insights from a public consultation conducted by the Horizon BEYOND project. It will explore how various stakeholder groups in Europe view current research ethics/ research integrity (RI/RE) policies and practices.

Methods
The public consultation used a mixed methods approach including (1) online questionnaire (205 responses) and (2) 31 interviews with stakeholders from CSOs, NGOs, industry, sleuths, journalists, research policy makers and advisory bodies. Quantitative data were statistically analysed, and qualitative data underwent thematic content analysis using Atlas.ti.

Results
The public consultation, carried out between October 2023 and February 2024, revealed that key gaps in RE/RI governance include insufficient evaluation of RE/RI training and policy effectiveness, lack of accountability mechanisms and limited training for senior researchers. While early-career researchers were more engaged in RI/RE trainings, senior researchers were often less involved, raising concerns about the transmission of a "hidden curriculum". Stakeholders also highlighted the need for clear, actionable RI/RE policies, supported by leadership and tailored to diverse research contexts. The "publish and perish" culture and inadequate support for whistleblowers were still viewed as the main drivers of misconduct by most of stakeholders. The participants also underscored the role of sleuths and journalists in exposing research misconduct and post-publication review practices. Although collaboration between sleuths, journalists and institutions or journals has led to some constructive outcomes, concerns persist in some stakeholder groups about the risks of public naming of wrongdoers and the potential harm to individuals and trust in science. Public trust in science emerged as another central concern, with transparency of misconduct investigations and meaningful public involvement seen as essential. Emerging challenges included the ethical use of AI, e.g. in peer review and generation of synthetic data, and the need for adapted RI/RE frameworks for citizen science.

Conclusion
The BEYOND public consultation underscores the need for cultural and policy-level changes in RI/RE governance. Addressing gaps in training, transparency and accountability, as well as fostering leadership commitment is essential. Findings have informed the BEYOND Best Practice Manual and Roadmap to 2030.

Leadership to Strengthen Research Culture and Foster Responsible Conduct of Research: A Case Study

Dr. Seán Lacey.[1] *Jean Ricken*[1]*, Stephen Cassidy*[1]
[1]*Munster Technological University, Ireland*

Objective
Munster Technological University (MTU) is a new university in the South-West of Ireland that aims to strengthen higher education and research in the area while contributing to national and international priorities. Institutional supports are central to advancing research capacity and culture. To understand and guide the development of supports, surveys were conducted, with interventions in between, providing both a baseline and real-time insights into research related perceptions and needs.

Method
This study used a longitudinal survey design to examine perceptions of research culture and responsible conduct of research (RCR) at MTU, with surveys in 2022 and 2024. Surveys were administered anonymously to staff across academic, research, professional, management, and support services roles, as well as research postgraduate students, capturing perceptions of institutional support, personal understanding of good research practices, and awareness of research policies. In between surveys, accessible training and supports on research integrity, research ethics, data management, responsible dissemination, and statistical analysis planning were developed and deployed.

Results
The 2022 survey revealed a research culture perception grounded in values-driven good practice, multidisciplinarity, inclusiveness, impact, and communication, while also exposing persistent obstacles. Between 2022 and 2024, perceptions of expertise in good research practices showed encouraging gains. Awareness of research impact, authorship, and collegial support remained consistently high ($p > 0.05$), with significant improvements in access to resources, grant support, and reporting pathways for inappropriate research behaviours ($p < 0.05$). In contrast, time for professional development remained persistently low. Knowledge of where to access research supports improved significantly for open access, data management, and authorship ($p < 0.05$). While the overall ranking of research practice topics changed little ($p > 0.05$), within-year differences showed research integrity and data management rising in importance. Open-ended responses reflected a parallel shift: in 2022, participants emphasised obstacles, but by 2024, the focus had moved toward training, resources, and constructive practices, suggesting an evolving culture shaped by emerging institutional supports.

Conclusion
Leadership in developing and deploying accessible training and supports has strengthened awareness and practice across the research community. Sustained attention to time and capacity for professional development will be essential to maintain these gains.

A Systemic Investigation of Scientific Misconduct: An Agent-Based Simulation of the Interplay Between Leadership, Education, and Incentive Structures

Mr. Kaixiang Kang[1], *Dr. Yizhou Fan*[2], *Dr. Ran Nakao*[3], ***Dr. Rei Nouchi***[2]
[1]*Prefectural University of Hiroshima, Hiroshima City, Japan,* [2]*Hiroshima University, Higashi-Hiroshima City, Japan,* [3]*Ehime University, Matuyama City, Japan*

Objective
This study utilizes agent-based modelling to examine systemic factors in academic environments that influence the occurrence and evolution of research misconduct. We investigate how ethics education and sanction interact with these structural factors to reshape lab culture, identifying under what conditions research integrity becomes the rational equilibrium rather than an exception.

Methods
Our agent-based model defines micro-level behavioral rules for individual agents (researchers and PIs) within simulated laboratories. Through their interactions and decisions, macro-level patterns of misconduct emerge. By systematically varying parameters including leadership, credit-sharing, and oversight, we analyze how these structural factors shape the system's overall integrity. This approach overcomes the empirical challenges of traditional methods and allows for a more operationally controlled and systematic analysis of such researcher behaviors.

Results
Our simulations reveal that leadership is the decisive factor in shaping lab culture, causing a strong polarization between entirely "clean" and deeply "corrupt" labs. As expected, ethics education reinforces and sustains the integrity of these "clean" labs. Interestingly, a highly ethical environment does not require agents to possess strong moral conviction. A modest level of ethical awareness is sufficient to deter research misconduct supported by consistent oversight and suctions. This suggests that ethical behavior emerges as a rational choice from a cost-benefit analysis, rather than depending on a high degree of innate morality. Moreover, when reputational feedback is highly cumulative (i.e., the "Matthew Effect"), research misconduct in early-career stages can become a rational strategy to establish long-term competitive advantage. This dynamic suggests that competitive academic structures can unintentionally reward short-term unethical choices. Overall, the model highlights those structural mechanisms, particularly leadership norms and reputational dynamics, primarily determine the equilibrium between integrity and misconduct.

Conclusion
Research misconduct is primarily driven by the systemic interplay of hierarchy, incentives, and oversight rather than individual moral failure. Interventions should facilitate a system environment where integrity, instead of misconduct, becomes the rational choice, by reforming current incentives and reward mechanisms. Further sensitivity analyses would be conducted to address insufficient calibration and to test the model's robustness.

Does the National Research Integrity Environment Relate to Public Opinion of Science?

Dr. Simon Fuglsang[1]
[1]*Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark*

It is often said that research integrity is key to trust in science. This rests on the intuitive assumption that the degree to which science upholds high standards is central to the evaluation of science, and that this is the case in science and society alike.

However, existing knowledge on the relationship between research integrity principles and practices on the one hand, and public opinion on science on the other, provides mixed results regarding the relationship between the two. While the public seems to be sensitive to differences in research practices when specifically asked to evaluate these, the interest and attention given to these aspects of research seems to be very limited in the public sphere.

Utilizing data from the International Research Integrity Survey (collected in the SOPs4RI project) and the Special Eurobarometer on knowledge and attitudes towards science and technology (collected by the European Commission), this study provides insight into the relationship between the state of research integrity and public opinion of science. These two datasets are the most comprehensive data sources in their fields and were collected within months of each other in 2021. As such, they provide a unique opportunity to test the core assumption outlined above.

To do so, this study utilizes researchers' evaluation of research integrity as a large-scale expert evaluation of country level research integrity standards. These evaluation center around, first, how researchers evaluate the level of adherence to research integrity principles in their working environment, and second, the degree to which researchers admit to having engaged in questionable research practices. By relating these expert evaluations of research integrity to public opinion of science, this study provides the first ever investigation of how individual level attitudes relate to the country level research integrity.

Preliminary findings indicate that research integrity and public opinion of science are weakly related, and that the relationship between the two is highly sensitive to control for other country-level characteristics.

A Living Lab: Findings From 'Valuing Voices for Equitable and Responsible Research'

Ms. Fleur Hughes[1], ***Ms. Megan Mcloughlin***[1]
[1]*University Of York, York, United Kingdom*

Successful research collaborations rely on one aspect: human interaction. Where there are strong relationships between researchers, administrators and technicians, teams have honest, meaningful conversations which address research integrity and security. These relationships are challenging to build within one institution, and when international collaborations span many cultural traditions, languages and academic systems, the scope for misunderstanding increases. Add to this a fast-paced, high pressure, hierarchical environment where funding deadlines force quick decisions, and not only do research integrity and security suffer, but research teams themselves risk being disadvantaged by inequitable research practices.

In this presentation, we will share our personal experiences of being part of a 'living lab', and the different approaches we have taken towards becoming a more equitable and responsible international research team. Valuing Voices is a research culture project, seeking to explore the wider meaning of "research undertaken with integrity". It aims to create an embedded culture within research teams of openness, trust, honesty and accountability. We use practical tools to spark conversations and reflection, leading to more equitable relationships within the research community, and between research teams and the wider public.

Central to the project is the creation of a free online tool, which supports research teams to apply five principles of equitable and responsible research. We will reflect on how we have tried to embody these principles in our project, exploring the challenges this posed in an international collaboration and sharing what worked (and crucially, what didn't). Topics covered will include distributed leadership approaches, reflection, results-based planning and environmental sustainability, and how they support research undertaken with integrity.

At this international conference, we will have a particular focus on the partnership between University of York in the UK and Mahidol University in Thailand, reflecting on effective, equitable international partnerships. Both presenters bring their experience as Professional Services staff and can share a different perspective to academic colleagues. Audience members will hear real, lived experience of a research project that has tried to 'practice what we preach', and learn some practical approaches to addressing research integrity that they may wish to try in their own research practice.

Titles and Entitlements in Research: Why They Matter in Fostering Research Integrity

Mr. Francis Kombe[1], *Prof Douglas Wassenaar*[2], *Prof Patricia Kingori*[3]
[1]*EthiXPERT NPC, SA,* [2]*University of KwaZulu-Natal, SA,* [3]*University of Oxford, UK*

Introduction
Fieldworker is a title used to refer to staff responsible for recruiting potential research participants, consenting and following up research participants. At the same time, other titles such as recruiters, data collectors, participant tracers, and research assistants have been used in place of fieldworkers. In some settings, fieldworkers could also include community-based staff, including nurses, doctors and clinicians. Although empirical data are scanty, the use of diverse titles with overlapping roles can be a potential source of tension, especially when they are perceived to serve as a tool for inequitable human resource management practices.

Methodology
During individual in-depth interviews with participants of a PhD study that examines the implications of fieldworkers' institutional support systems for research integrity practices in Africa, fieldworkers' titles and entitlements emerged as an important theme that reportedly influenced their perceived value in the research ecosystem, with the potential to negatively affect their data collection practices. Study participants reported on the evolving tensions between the fieldworkers' titles and the perceived entitlements arising from their data collection roles, and the potential effect these tensions could have on the overall integrity of research.

Findings
The fieldworker title was perceived by some participants to play no or little role in fieldworkers' everyday practices. However, the majority of participants believed the fieldworker title was demeaning and evoked a feeling of worthlessness, low self-esteem, leading some fieldworkers to hide their identity [by introducing themselves as doctors] during data collection. On the other hand, fieldworkers were overwhelmingly perceived as central to the research process, making them develop a sense of entitlement and wonder why they were not included as co-authors, co-PIs, or allowed to analyse the data they collected. Reportedly, some fieldworkers' misbehaviours, including cutting corners, using white lies and inability to uphold good data collection standards, were influenced by the use of this "demeaning title" and the infringement of their entitlements, arising from a lack of recognition in the knowledge production pipeline.

Discussion
Research-producing institutions may need to intentionally balance these nuanced yet critical human resource dynamics in the quest to nurture a conducive environment for the responsible conduct of research.

Demystifying Invisible Authorship: Ethical Use of Generative AI to Uphold Research Integrity in Higher Education

Dr. Nancy Kwangwa[1]
[1]*Women's University in Africa, Harare, Zimbabwe*

Objective
This study explores how the principles of research integrity are being threatened and reshaped in the age of generative artificial intelligence (Gen-AI). Guided by the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, the study examines how researchers in higher education understand, value, and practice research integrity when using Gen-AI tools as silent collaborators or invisible authors in scholarly work.

Methods
The study adopted a qualitative research method and used an action research design and collaborated with students, lecturers, research coordinators and librarians at the Women's University in Africa. Research questions were guided by the principles of the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, and data were collected from semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and document analysis. Data were analysed thematically following Braun and Clarke's framework, identifying knowledge, values and practices on research integrity when using Gen-AI.

Results
Findings show that most researchers and students admitted to using Gen-AI to complete research projects without declaring how they have used it. The majority of students and some staff members showed limited knowledge of research integrity. Participants viewed research integrity as an abstract ideal rather than a lived practice; most indicated that they rarely, if ever, think about it consciously while conducting research. The study revealed a lack of training programmes and guidelines on research integrity in the age of Gen-AI. The absence of policies and guidelines causes uncertainty among staff and students about ethical expectations.

The study revealed that research integrity is equated with preventing plagiarism, overlooking broader ethical responsibilities such as accountability, honesty, fairness and authorship. Concerns were raised regarding the blurred authorship boundaries when using Gen-AI, which threatens research integrity.

Insights from the study led to the development of joint workshops of students, researchers and librarians to rethink and co-develop ethical guidelines for Gen-AI use in research. The workshops stressed that research integrity is a dynamic practice that requires reflection, capacity building, policy development and collective accountability in the face of technological developments.

Conclusion
The study shows that maintaining research integrity in the era of Gen-AI facilitates both conceptual and institutional renewal. Strengthening research integrity involves developing guidelines, training programmes and policies.

Are Edited Volumes the New Special Issues?

Dr. Svetlana Kleiner[1]
[1]*Springer Nature, Dordrecht, Netherlands*

After journals tightened their checks and controls for special issues, AI generation, mass submission, unverified authorship and citation pushing in books has been becoming more frequent. This talk provides an overview of the problem posed by this phenomenon.
Contributor “A” has published 57 volumes since 2017 – initially a mix of edited volumes and proceedings. However, after 2021, “A” focussed on edited volumes. These include irrelevant chapters, subpar contributions, and the overall number of volumes is unusually high (7 published in 2025 alone). There are concerns that “A” may be running a paper mill.
Contributor “B” has submitted 14 total book proposals since 2022 on topics ranging from machine learning to climate change resilience and chartered accountancy, which is not typical for a single author/editor. In his 8 edited volumes, “B” contributed multiple papers for each volume, either alone or in co-authorship. There are concerns about AI text generation in these volumes, as well as dubious co-authorship.
Contributor “C” has submitted 8 edited volumes and 5 proceedings proposals since 2023. In the 4 already-published edited volumes, “C” is featured prolifically across the table of contents, mostly in co-authorship with other contributors. In most of these papers, the references section is heavily skewed towards “C”s published work (sometimes over 40% of the total number of references). There are concerns about AI text generation in these chapters, h-index hacking and dubious co-authorship.
These are just several examples that illustrate a larger issue: after hijacking special issues, bad actors may now be using books – largely edited volumes - to publish questionable research.
Retractions in an edited volume are problematic: retraction of multiple papers in the same volume makes the volume unappealing to readers who may not want a volume with several retracted chapters; however, retraction of the whole volume affects the authors uninvolved in violations. The talk will discuss possible solutions, such as “dual” retraction notes, better awareness at pre-publication stage and quality control solutions.

Understanding Paper Mills in Scholarly Communication: A Scoping Review of Current Evidence and Research

Mr. Joonha Jeon[1]
[1]*Center for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS), Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands*

Paper mills are fraudulent entities that seek profit by supplying fabricated or low-quality research in academic publishing, posing a growing threat to research integrity. Although awareness has grown as multi-stakeholder coalitions like United2Act have formed and encouraging collaborative efforts, our understanding of paper mills is still at an early stage remaining fragmented and largely relying on isolated case studies, requiring further research. This knowledge gap is compounded by its secretive operations, evolving tactics, and different norms and practices of scholarly publishing between regions and disciplines.

This study, part of a recently started PhD project, addresses the knowledge gap through an extended scoping review that synthesizes current evidence and understanding of paper mills. Building upon the bibliography compiled by United2Act Working Group 3 (2024), we incorporate recent literature on related topics and supplement this with the dataset of retracted articles suspected to have originated from paper mills. Following identification of major incidents, we apply a structured analytical framework across four thematic domains to determine: (1) characteristics and consequences of paper mill products, (2) stakeholder roles and (ir)responsibilities, (3) operational patterns and how the manipulations were revealed, and (4) regional and disciplinary contexts. In addition, this review also examines the state of paper mill research undertaken mostly by investigative researchers, via extracting insights on causal interpretations, suggested detection markers, and proposed countermeasures.

Our findings reveal an accelerating trend in both paper mill activities and associated retractions, attributable to both the expansion of relevant businesses and increasing awareness of paper mills. Also, the paper mill operations are becoming more complicated, particularly through the integration of generative AI tools into their manipulative work. These dynamics position paper mills as a moving target, demanding sustained research efforts and adaptive intervention strategies. Only through understanding the systematic manipulations in play will we be able to suggest solutions. The results of the scoping review will provide a foundation for developing conceptual frameworks to further study the complex dynamics of paper mills within the academic publishing ecosystem. This will also help identify and map recently proposed interventions across multiple stakeholders to combat the problems caused by paper mills.

Identifying, Mapping, and Investigating Network Behaviours to Safeguard Research Integrity and Publishing Ethics at Elsevier

Miss Sarah Jenkins[1], *Dr. Marianna Taffi*[1], *Mr. Duncan Anning*[1]
[1]*Elsevier, Oxford, United Kingdom*

Objective
We outline diagnostic and investigative approaches developed at Elsevier for detecting and acting on coordinated misconduct by papermills, citation rings, and other networks seeking to subvert the editorial and publishing process.

Methods
Our study is based on a sample of 24 networks of varying types and sizes, identified across Elsevier journals and comprising over 1100 members in total, acting in a mix of author, editor, and reviewer roles. The analysis combines data from internal and external sources and was performed using in-house tools, including: (1) a Python library that checks submissions for 34 signals of integrity concerns; (2) dashboards tracking citation-prompting and outlier citation trends linked to the handling/review of papers; (3) a prototype conflicts of interest checker; and (4) a prototype network visualization utility that maps relationships indicative of co-involvement in diverse integrity concerns.

The resulting investigative leads were pursued by a specialist team using a range of systematic checks to examine flagged concerns, uncover issues that may evade automated detection, and gather evidence as a basis for corrective/preventive action.

Results
Our analysis enabled a broad-spectrum mapping—at the network, journal, person, and paper levels, over different time intervals—of established and emerging patterns of behaviour aimed at unfairly advantaging network members and associated beneficiaries. Networked misconduct was found to be a key integrity risk to journals, driving high proportions of prospective retractions and citation manipulation, often within short periods. Having identified numerous papers compromised by these networks, we will report on remedial actions initiated at scale—including retractions, notifications to readers, and removals from reviewer pools and editorial boards. The study indicates that deceptive/distributed mechanisms of manipulation employed by many networks cannot reasonably be detected by individual editors, emphasizing the need to complement editorial vigilance with new technological solutions and specialist screening and investigations.

Conclusion
Our study provides insights into the structures and behaviours of networks seeking to compromise the publishing process, enabling earlier interventions to safeguard the scientific record. The same networks are active beyond Elsevier journals and the measures employed in detecting and countering their misconduct have broad relevance to other publishers, editors, and professionals.

Navigating Research Integrity in Doctoral Education: A Study of Misconduct in Doctoral Defence Practices in Mongolia

Mrs. Orkhon Gantogtokh[1]
[1]*University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada*

Doctoral defences are pivotal in upholding the credibility and integrity of doctoral education. In Mongolia, however, defence practices, administered by centralised committees rooted in Soviet traditions, face structural, cultural, and ethical challenges. This study examines how systemic, socio-economic, and historical factors shape defence practices, creating vulnerabilities to favouritism, corruption, and compromised scholarly assessment.

The study draws on semi-structured interviews with 37 stakeholders, including members of the Defence Committee, faculty, doctoral candidates, and policymakers from major Mongolian public universities. Using thematic analysis, the study explores governance, assessment, and ethical norms, analysing committee composition, regulatory frameworks, and candidate experiences within the broader context of post-socialist and neoliberal transformations in higher education.

Findings reveal that Mongolian doctoral defences remain highly summative, politicised, and susceptible to misconduct. Common issues include ghostwriting, plagiarism, favouritism, opaque decision-making, and financial or political influence overriding merit. Structural and cultural factors exacerbate these challenges: neoliberal, self-funded higher education pressures universities to prioritise enrolment over quality; status-driven candidates and historical hierarchies perpetuate patronage and title-seeking; and weak conflict-of-interest policies undermine ethical oversight. Participants reported inconsistent standards, limited constructive feedback, and substantial emotional and financial burdens on students. Regulatory reforms, such as digital registries for defence committee members, smaller topic-relevant subcommittees, and more merit-based selection of committee members, as well as emerging international collaborations, show promise for enhancing transparency and accountability. However, systemic and cultural barriers persist, misaligning Mongolian practices with global models that emphasise collegiality, formative assessment, and ethical scholarship. Stakeholders highlighted that embedding transparent governance, enforceable ethical guidelines, structured pre-defence evaluation, mentorship, and formative support is crucial to fostering academic integrity and producing defensible dissertations.

Mongolia's doctoral defence system demonstrates a misalignment between formal regulations and ethical scholarship. Addressing this requires structural and cultural reform, as well as the integration of transparent governance, ethical oversight, and institutional investment. While findings rely on stakeholder interviews and document analysis, they provide actionable insights for enhancing doctoral assessment and safeguarding the credibility of doctoral degrees.

Magnitude and Factors Associated with Research Misconduct at a Public University in Ethiopia: A Cross-Sectional Survey

Mr. Habtamu Hailu[1]
[1]*Ethiopian Defence University, Ethiopia*

Objective
This study aimed to identify factors contributing to research misconduct and questionable research practices among researchers at a public university in Ethiopia, examine attitudes towards responsible research conduct, and assess the magnitude of such behaviors to address the gap in empirical evidence on this specific topic.

Method
An institutional-based cross-sectional study was conducted. The study included faculty members from the university's Health Science College who were actively engaged in research and publication. Data were collected via a self-administered, structured questionnaire adapted from similar study. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and multivariable logistic regression.

Result
A total of 244 researchers participated in the study, resulting in an 82% response rate. In our study, 37.7% of participants reported engaging in at least one form of misconduct, 95% CI [31.6%, 44.1%]. Authorship wrongdoing was the most common type of misconduct, with 47.5% of participants admitting to it, 95% CI [41.1%, 54.0%]. Falsification was the second most reported, with 38.9% of respondents admitting involvement, 95% CI [32.8%, 45.4%]. Fabrication was the least frequently reported misconduct at 15.2%, 95% CI [10.9%, 20.3%]. Participants above the position of lecturer are substantially less likely to fabricate or falsify than those below it [($p < 0.013$, AOR = 0.499, 95% CI: 0.288 - 0.863)]. The likelihood that participants feel publication pressure and believe it is influential in involving them in overall research misconduct is three times more than that of participants who experience no pressure to publish at all [AOR = 3.180; 95% CI (1.017, 9.946)].

Conclusion
This study highlights the prevalence of research misconduct and questionable research practices among academic researchers, with authorship misconduct, fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism being the most commonly reported types. The present study lacks statistical significance between prior ethics training and research misconduct. The study may be limited by self-reporting biases, which are common in surveys addressing sensitive topics like research misconduct. The cross-sectional design restricts the ability to establish a temporal relationship.

4.E - Oral Session

May 5, 2026, 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Responsibility and Risk Using AI in Research in Social Sciences and Humanities

Dr. Kari Steen-Johnsen[1,2], ***Dr. Vidar Enebakk***[1]
[1]*The National Committee for Research Ethics in Social Sciences and Humanities (NESH), Oslo, Norway,*
[2]*Institute for Social Research (ISF), Oslo, Norge*

Developing guidelines for responsible use of artificial intelligence (AI) in research can be difficult, having to find a balance between specific challenges, general principles and different modes of research. Further, regulatory frameworks have a strong emphasis on risk and security, which makes it hard to sustain a space for ethical reflection, deliberation and decision making. How can we combine responsibility and risk when using AI in research in social sciences and humanities?

In 2025 The National Committee for Research Ethics in Social Sciences and Humanities (NESH) set out to revise our existing "Guide to Internet Research Ethics" (2019), while also trying to meet new challenges: In what way does generative AI raise new questions for research? What kind of technologies should be covered? What set of concepts should be applied? And what should be the scope of the new guide?

In our discussion we will share important insights from the ongoing discussions in NESH, explaining the underlying reflections and rationale behind the new and revised document, "Artificial Intelligence, Humans and Societies. A Guide to Research Ethics" (NESH, 2026). We'll highlight the key concepts of truth, human dignity and democracy. And we'll emphasize the need for a reflexive approach to risk appraisal with special relevance for research in social sciences and humanities, related to "The Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law" (Council of Europe, 2024).

While also drawing on insights from a specific case discussed in NESH, we especially invite inputs on the role of risk assessment in social sciences and humanities. Going beyond notions of responsible development or dual use, we outline a broader framework to risk assessment also covering the societal impact of generative AI on the public sphere, democracy, and rule of law. Responsible use of AI in research, we argue, must involve such broader reflections and societal factors in risk appraisal and risk assessment.

Rigour in Mixed Methods Research: A Metascientific Systematic Review

Ms. Adira Daniel[1] *Dr. Tamarinde Haven*[2]
[1]*University of Western Ontario,* [2]*Tilburg University*

Objective
Mixed methods research (mmr), which integrates qualitative and quantitative approaches, is playing an increasingly central role in research. Yet most discussions of rigour emphasize validity and replicability from quantitative traditions, while qualitative traditions stress trustworthiness and reflexivity. Positioned at this intersection, mmr inherits both strengths and tensions, making it a critical test case for advancing responsible research practices.

Method
We conducted a metascientific systematic review of rigour in mixed-methods psychological research, incorporating findings from (1) psychology-specific [psyinfo] and multidisciplinary [web of science; pubmed] databases; (2) three top mixed-methods journals, and (3) gray literature. Eligible sources included peer-reviewed empirical mmr studies in psychology, referencing rigour, as well as methodological papers and reviews. Data extraction captured definitions, criteria, frameworks, strategies, and reporting practices, with a focus on identifying which rigour strategies were applied.

Results
Screening and extraction are ongoing, with full results anticipated by the conference. Preliminary analysis of studies published in 2024 (n ≈ 160) suggests that the most common rigour strategies were applied during analysis (31%) or embedded in the study design (25%). However, approximately 35% of studies did not provide a reference or citation for their chosen rigour strategy, indicating gaps in transparency and methodological justification. Anticipated final results will include a detailed breakdown of where and how rigour strategies are used, the frequency and type of framework citations, and longitudinal trends in responsible mixed methods research practices.

Conclusion
This review will provide one of the first systematic mappings of how research rigour is defined, applied, and reported in mmr. Early evidence suggests unev en application and justification of rigour strategies, with over-reliance on certain phases (e.g., design). Addressing these gaps could strengthen not only mmr methodology but also broader efforts to foster research integrity, reproducibility, and public trust in psychological science. Limitations include restriction to english-language publications and focus on psychology, with future work broadening the disciplinary scope.

A Systematic Review of Validated Tools for Measuring Responsible Conduct of Research

Dr. Thea Marie Drachen[1], ***Dr. Mette Eriksen***[1,2], *Dr. Bjørn Hofmann*[3,4], *Dr. Niklas Juth*[5], *Prof. Gert Helgesson*[6], *Prof. Søren Holm*[7]

[1]*University Library Of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark,* [2]*CEBMO & Cochrane Denmark, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark,* [3]*Centre for Medical Ethics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway,* [4]*The Norwegian University for Science and Technology, Department for Health Science, Gjøvik, Norway,* [5]*Centre for Research ethics and Bioethics, Department of Public Health and Caring Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden,* [6]*Stockholm Centre for Healthcare Ethics, Department of Learning, Informatics, Management and Ethics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,* [7]*University of Manchester, Centre for Social Ethics and Policy, School of Law, Manchester, United Kingdom*

Objective

In the quest to assess research integrity, researchers are using existing questionnaires or develop their own new questionnaires. The variety of different measuring tools makes it difficult to compare the results of these surveys between studies. Additionally, many of the measurement tools are not validated and for those that have been, the level of validation varies in rigor. This systematic review aims to identify and provide a list of validated tools that measure responsible conduct of research (RCR) and questionable research practice (QRP) among researchers.

Method

A protocol for the review is available in Open Science Framework (DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/97RGM). A systematic literature search was performed in Medline (Ovid), Embase (Ovid), PsycINFO (Ovid), Scopus (Elsevier), Academic Search Premier (Ebsco) and references were screened against eligibility criteria: studies that have validated RCR or QRP survey instruments (in a population of researchers including PhD students).

Included studies were assessed for the rigor of validation by applying a modified version of COSMIN. We classified an instrument to meet minimum validation rigor, if it was validated for at least comprehension and relevance by a reasonably large group of experts or quantitatively validated. Studies were thus divided into those that fulfilled minimum criteria for adequate validation, and those that did not. Forward and backward citation searches were performed on the studies that met minimum criteria for validation.

Results

A total of 8210 studies were imported into Covidence, 2507 duplicates were removed and 5703 were screened (title / abstract), 151 full texts were screened for eligibility and 50 studies included. 37 were deemed to meet minimum validation standards and 13 were validated, but with less rigorous instrument validation.

Conclusion

This review provides a list of validated tools that can be used as a guide to which validated questionnaires are available to measure specific aspects of RCR and QRP. The tools that are rigorously validated may serve as templates for use and for how to validate RCR and QRP measurement tools going forward. The overall standard of validation of tools in this area seems to be less rigorous than in the psychology or health fields.

Generative AI and Intellectual Property in Higher Education: Redefining Academic Integrity

*Ms. Enise Ozçankaya[1], **Mr. Muhammet Demirbilek**[1]*
[1]Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey

Objective
This study investigates how university students perceive the ethical use of AI in academic contexts and how these perceptions influence their understanding of academic misconduct.

Method
A cross-sectional survey design was used with 222 students, mainly from Süleyman Demirel University, Turkey. Participants completed the AI and Academic Integrity Survey Instrument, covering demographics, policy awareness, perceived misconduct, and attitude. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation tests, and regression models to identify misconduct perceptions.

Results
Findings show that students distinguish between traditional misconduct and GenAI based academic practices. While plagiarism and having others write assignments are still considered serious misconduct, many students view limited AI use as legitimate support rather than cheating. The use of generative AI tools produced mixed judgments. For instance, using ChatGPT for brainstorming or revising papers was often rated as “not misconduct” or at most “minor misconduct,” indicating that students tend to regard these practices as supportive rather than deceptive. This shift reveals a growing gap between traditional policies and students’ lived experiences. Regression analysis highlighted that general ethical attitudes and policy awareness were not strong predictors of perceptions. Instead, judgments about authorship—particularly scenarios where GenAI or peers replaced intellectual contribution—emerged as the most decisive factor.

Conclusion
The findings indicate that students demonstrate nuanced ethical reasoning: they generally do not identify ethical concerns when GenAI is employed to support the learning process; however, they regard the production of content produced entirely by GenAI as constituting academic misconduct. This distinction highlights students’ ability to differentiate between legitimate educational support and actions that undermine academic integrity. These insights carry important implications for higher education institutions, particularly in the development of policies and guidelines that clarify appropriate uses of GenAI. They also underscore the necessity of fostering digital literacy and ethical awareness, ensuring that students are not only equipped with technical skills but also with the capacity to critically evaluate the ethical dimensions of emerging technologies in academic contexts. Limitations include reliance on self-report, highlighting the need for broader, mixed-method research.

Why the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity is too Shallow Regarding Generative AI

Prof. Gustaaf Cornelis[1], ***Ms. Marijke Van Vlasselaer***[1]
[1]*Free University Brussels (vub), Belgium*

Although ALLEA'23 (European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity) urges researchers to be transparent about their use of generative AI, openness is simply not enough to avoid misuse. By generative AI researchers can better cope with academic pressure (to excel, to publish, to meet the workload). Being transparent is not a free card to use generative AI as broadly as wanted. Besides, transparency is not further defined, so it depends on the integrity of the researcher to decide how detailed the declaration about the use is. However, even being open about the use, the application of generative AI as such remains in contradiction with other parts of the ethical code.

Generative AI is welcomed by many: as long the bubble holds, it helps researchers by the many tasks they need to perform, regarding education, research, societal and institutional services. One can expect that the majority will be brought to use AI within the next five years; the competition between faculties and universities is severe. Since research money is allocated by comparison of research production and because universities benchmark each other, shortly after we will be back to square one. Academic live will be as hectic as it was before. Codes of conduct have an ethical purpose, not only to make researchers adhere to integrity, but also to create a healthy research environment and serve wellbeing. The use of AI only shifts the pressure problem for a couple of years, in the meantime distracting academic leadership from the causes of distress experienced by researchers. Such codes also urge for a respect for the environment, while extensive use of generative AI has an enormous footprint.

In this presentation we enlist the shortcomings of ALLEA'23 regarding the use of generative AI. We analyze other codes of conduct (international and local), make comparisons and suggest durable solutions.

Institutionalizing Research Integrity in Kenya: Perspectives of the Research Community on Kenya Medical Research Institute's Research Integrity Policy at the 9th Bioethics Society of Kenya Conference

Ms. Victoria Chepkorir Soi[1], *Mr James Nguya*[1], *Mr. Geoffrey Sang*[1], *Ms. Lilian Achacha*[1], *Mr. Enock Kebenei*[1], *Ms. Melba Katindi*[1,2]
[1]*Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kenya,* [2]*High Court of Kenya, Kenya*

Objective
In 2023, the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) established a Research Integrity Committee (RIC) to institutionalize Research Integrity. Research integrity (RI) policy initiatives remain limited in resource-limited country contexts, and few efforts have documented how such roll-outs are perceived and embraced within African research environments. This abstract presents feedback collected during a Research Integrity symposium at the 9th Bioethics Society of Kenya (BSK) conference held on 11th and 12th September 2025 in Nairobi, Kenya.

Method
A structured survey was administered to 57 respondents at the RI symposium which included researchers, academia, Research Ethics Committee members, officials from professional medical bodies and administrators. Responses were analyzed to assess perceived impact, success indicators, anticipated changes, and expectations regarding the RI policy's influence on research practice at KEMRI.

Results
Respondents viewed the policy as an important step towards building a culture on integrity in Kenyan research. Nearly half 49.1% (28) felt that awareness and capacity building of the RI policy would have the most significant long-term impact, followed by strengthening institutional culture 28.1% (16). Leadership commitment and institutional support 80.7% (46), followed by clear monitoring and enforcement mechanisms 61.4% (35) were considered key to the RI Policy's success, along with adequate funding/resources and researcher buy-in 36.8% each (21 each). Regarding anticipated day-to-day changes in research practice, the most cited outcome was stronger oversight of research processes 50.9% (29), followed by greater accountability in reporting and publications 42.1% (24) and increased training and awareness 31.6% (18). Respondents expect evidence of an institutional culture that values and rewards RI 35.1% (20) and fewer cases of misconduct or swifter resolution 33.3% (19) as the most effective indicators of the policy's success over the next five years.

Conclusion
Overall, the research community expressed strong support for KEMRI's policy's and its potential to promote responsible and ethical research conduct. The responses add to the common global desire to foster a culture of integrity, transparency, and accountability in research across similar country contexts.

4.F - Oral Session

May 5, 2026, 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Globalising Research Integrity from a Funder's Perspective: Wellcome's Journey to Evolve Its Funding Policy Approach

Ms. Sue Russell[1], ***Dr. Anne Taylor***
[1]*Wellcome, United Kingdom*

Wellcome's vision is a healthier future for everyone by solving urgent health challenges. To drive equitable health outcomes, Wellcome aims to advance inclusive practices that broaden the range of people leading, participating in, and benefiting from science it funds.

In an increasingly global research landscape, research funders like Wellcome can play a pivotal role in promoting global research integrity to ensure research is high quality, trustworthy, ethical, and responsible wherever it is undertaken in the world.

To date, Wellcome's traditional approach to strengthen research integrity has primarily focused on UK research environments, standards, priorities and challenges. Wellcome is evolving its approach to better understand and support global organisations and research communities in diverse, international contexts.

This talk will guide participants through Wellcome's nascent journey to strengthen its global approach to research integrity across diverse research ecosystems in Africa and Asia.

The presenters will examine Wellcome's considerations, challenges and opportunities to date as a research funder to promote and embed principles of research integrity globally.

The talk will cover Wellcome's globalisation and equity strategic priorities and drivers of change in its funding policies using equitable and inclusive approaches and understanding priorities and ethical perspectives of diverse range of research communities. Presenters will discuss balancing universal standards with flexibility and adaptation to local and cultural contexts, moving beyond a traditional compliance-driven approach, and working in partnership to support initiatives to influence good research practices.

Presenters will discuss what they have learned so far, sharing behind the scenes insights of a research funder. The session will be interactive, inviting audience participation to share ideas and feedback on how research funders, including Wellcome, can responsibly and effectively promote research integrity on a global scale.

These audience insights will help shape Wellcome's future efforts to support good research practice worldwide. By sharing Wellcome's journey, the presenters hope to foster a broader, ongoing dialogue and collaboration towards a more equitable and trustworthy global research system.

Handling Alleged Research Misconduct Across Europe: A Comparative Overview of National Systems

Mr. Lodewijk Pet[1], *Prof. Frits Rosendaal*[1], *Mrs. Yvonne Erkens*[2]
[1]*LUMC, Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden, Netherlands,* [2]*Leiden University, Faculty of Law, Leiden, Netherlands*

Objective
European countries address research misconduct through diverse frameworks that share core principles such as honesty and accountability but differ in procedures, oversight, definitions, and whistleblower protections. These variations can complicate cross-border collaboration and raise questions about fairness in investigations of alleged misconduct. This project aims to create a comprehensive, verified overview of national systems to enable comparison across research integrity frameworks and encourage mutual learning.

Method
Large language models were used to collect and code publicly available sources, including national codes of conduct, higher-education and whistleblower laws, and institutional procedures, for all European countries. Information regarding the national system, case handling procedures, laws, documents, and major events were captured. Entries are currently being validated with input from national Research Integrity Officers or documents provided by them.

(Preliminary) Results
All 44 European countries possess mechanisms to address alleged misconduct, with the earliest frameworks dating to 1992. Governance models vary: 22 countries (50%) use hybrid systems combining national and institutional committees, 18 (41%) are decentralized, and 4 (9%) are centralized. About half of the countries clearly define questionable practices alongside fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism (FFP) in their documents, while 18 (41%) restrict definitions to FFP and four lack any formal definition. Appeal systems are available in 31 (70%) countries and 41 (93%) allow judicial appeals, although these are rarely pursued. Explicit whistleblower protection specific to research integrity is present in 36% of countries. Openness of cases on alleged misconduct vary substantially. About half of the countries publish anonymized national or institutional statistics, 8 (18%) countries provide detailed case information or summaries. Only 2 (5%) provide access to searchable libraries of alleged misconduct cases with filter options and keywords. Data are subjected to hallucinations and misinterpretations and are undergoing validation.

Conclusion
European research integrity systems differ in major structural elements. Even among comparable systems, practical differences such as transparency or the admissibility of complaints complicates collaboration. Many countries share similar principles and refer to international frameworks, but this alignment does not automatically translate into similar practical application. Consequently, comparable cases may receive different advice depending on the country, raising questions about fairness.

Against the Grain of the Colonial Archive: Indigenous Ontologies and Humanities Scholarship

Dr. Michael Roellinghoff[1]
[1]*University Of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

Objective
This paper examines how non-native Humanities scholars, and especially those engaged in history and cultural studies, articulate Indigenous ontologies, agency, and sovereignty. Using the Japanese colonization of Hokkaido – the unceded territories of the Ainu people – as a case study, I argue that research into settler colonialism or into the national/regional histories of settler colonies requires an active methodological shift towards Indigenous ontologies and historical memory.

Method
First, I examine the history of knowledge production to analyze how academic institutions were historically often complicit in colonization. I then critically analyze foundational studies and investigate how colonial logics continue to shape modern scholarship today. Finally, and centrally, I engage with Indigenous-authored texts to challenge colonial historiography.

Results
Drawing on Ainu critiques of Japanese history-writing and demands for Indigenous-centred scholarship, this study demonstrates how centring Indigenous texts is fundamental to moving beyond received historiography. Applying this methodology reveals that relying primarily on sources derived from colonial archives and writing “towards the grain” of mainstream historiography risks reproducing anti-Indigenous/colonial logics, regardless of the intentions of the individual scholar. In the case of Hokkaido, this is evident in the enduring influence of scholars emerging from Japan’s pre-war Colonial Studies programs, whose frameworks have long defined the field of Ainu history. In contrast, substantively engaging with an Indigenous counter-archive comprised of works by memory keepers and activists enables scholars to go "against the grain" of received historiography. This approach challenges colonial archives by foregrounding Indigenous historical memory, agency, and critiques of empire. Applicable to other settler colonial locales such as Canada, Australia, or the United States, it thus provides the necessary framework to enable scholars to produce both more ethical and more academically rigorous research.

Conclusion
The case of Hokkaido demonstrates that research integrity is often inextricable from epistemic justice. This necessitates that scholars whose works relate to settler colonialism place significant and sustained emphasis on Indigenous texts and ontologies. This paper provides a concrete model for this methodological shift.

The Ethics and Etiquette of Forensic Peer Review: A Collaborative Online Ethnography

Dr. Irene Pasquetto[1], *Jay Patel*[1], *Niveda Tennety*[1], *Nikki Pratt*[1], *Joel Chan*[1]
[1]*University of Maryland, College Park, USA*

We present the ethical challenges that people encounter when they evaluate research in public settings like social media sites and personal websites. Scholars debate what to name this practice, and some refer to it as forensic peer review (FPR) (Heathers, 2021). By describing its diversity and complexity ethnographically, we aim to mitigate the often-heated debates and offer solutions like practice guides, tools, and training so that its virtues override its vices.
A subset of our team conducted a separate web-based ethnography of forensic peer review and inspired the protocol of this second web-based ethnography. Using an initial set of FPR cases, settings, tools, and ethical issues, we began the ethnography, sampling cases about the ethics of conducting FPR from social media sites like X, Bluesky, and LinkedIn. We also sampled cases from PubPeer, Retraction Watch, ResearchHub, and alphaXiv. In them, we embedded three ethnographers to study brief, casual posts about erroneous study reports and long-form, multifaceted posts spanning days.
We will complete data collection and qualitative data analysis by January 2026. To extract patterns from related cases, we will use thematic analysis. Thus far, we've discovered cases in which people debate the tone, processes, and impacts of FPRs. For example, many debate whether, when, and how to contact and involve investigated authors. Scholars and laypeople debate whether FPRs should be anonymous, how to communicate the uncertainty of accusations, the extent to which review processes should be transparent, and whether FPRs should themselves be independently reviewed. We present examples of 1) the key ethical issues that are debated in the community; 2) the multitude of perspectives about these issues; and 3) the existing norms for reviewing that forensic reviewers developed for themselves experientially.
Our cases gesture toward a thorny path strewn with conflicting histories, motives, and incentives. These dilemmas of ethics and etiquette, we argue, require resolution in an inclusive, participatory setting that invites diverse agents to co-develop much-needed, shared guidelines with the mediation of independent scholars. Future studies can test the generalizability of our results and proposed solutions by studying FPR in non-English settings with greater attention to the humanities.

Good Research Practice 2024: Implementing the ALLEA Code in a Swedish (Unofficial) National Code of Conduct

Dr. Teresa Ottinger[1], ***Dr. Karolina Wallenborg Bjelic***[1]
[1]*Swedish Research Council, Stockholm, Sweden*

The Swedish Research Council's "Good Research Practice" is not an official national code of conduct, but has in effect been treated as such since the first edition in 2005. Previous editions have been used both as a normative source in handling deviations and as an educational tool. The document was extensively revised in both structure and content during 2023–2024, and a new edition was launched at the end of 2024 in a new format.
The new version is based on the ALLEA Code which is elaborated and put into the Swedish context, thus primarily aiming to provide researchers and research organizations active in Sweden with a solid and practical foundation for adhering to and promoting good research practice. The document covers principles and formal and legal aspects, but also particularly lifts continuous ethical reflection as essential for researchers and others involved in research.
The revision work involved many challenges, such as balancing expectations and wishes from different target groups and finding a level that researchers from most disciplines can relate to, without becoming too detailed or extensive. We have also gained new insights and lessons that are important for the implementation of the document as well as for future revisions.
In our presentation, we briefly describe the structure and format of the new "Good Research Practise 2024", our key insights from the process, and what we know about how the new edition has been received by the target groups so far.

Embedding Ethical Governance in Artificial Intelligence Research: Strengthening Integrity Frameworks for the Global South

Mr. Victor Benjamin Oshodi[1]
[1]Association For the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence AAAI-Nigeria Chapter, Lagos Island, Nigeria, [2]The International Association for Safe & Ethical AI, 501 W Broadway Suite 1540, United States

The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence (AI) research presents both unprecedented opportunities and complex ethical challenges for global science. While much of the current discourse on research integrity focuses on traditional academic misconduct, the rise of AI systems introduces new dimensions of bias, data ethics, algorithmic accountability, and reproducibility. This paper explores the intersection of AI ethics, governance, and research integrity, focusing particularly on the structural and institutional challenges faced by emerging economies in the Global South.

Drawing on case studies from Africa's evolving technology ecosystem, the study proposes a framework for ethical AI governance grounded in integrity principles—transparency, accountability, and inclusivity. It argues that responsible AI development must extend beyond compliance to embed moral reasoning and societal values within the research process itself. By integrating integrity frameworks into AI research design, education, and policymaking, developing nations can establish resilient scientific cultures capable of addressing both local and global ethical standards.

The paper concludes by highlighting collaborative strategies between academia, government, and civil society for co-developing guidelines that promote trustworthy, human-centred AI research. Such an approach ensures that innovation is not pursued in isolation but aligned with integrity, equity, and long-term societal benefit.

Implications for Genuineness of Indigenous Knowledge Streams in AI-Driven Contexts: A Perspective from the Global South

Mr. Fahad Mahmood[1]
[1]*Department Of Digital Media Scs, University of The Punjab, Lahore Pakistan, Pakistan*

Artificial intelligence has created challenges and opportunities for the indigenous knowledge around the world. The preservation, development and dissemination of indigenous knowledge in AI driven academic scenarios offer uncertainties.

Indigenous knowledge holds pivotal significance in the identity, wellbeing and development of a society. The nations of Global South are not much active in research and development on artificial intelligence and stand on receiving ends of this innovation. Therefore, challenges for the preservation and development in indigenous knowledge streams are real for these nations.
Pakistan offers rich streams of indigenous knowledge that are ingrained to several social science disciplines including politics, sociology, gender studies and communications studies. This is because of the history of the land that hosts civilizations such as the Indus (3300 BCE), MehrGarh (7000 BCE) and Gandhara (1500 BCE).
This study has tried to understand the challenges and opportunities that are present for social sciences academics in the context of AI and indigenous knowledge. I have especially focused on the genuineness of indigenous knowledge and academic integrity associated with its utilization in education and research in AI driven academic scenarios.
Data is collected via semi structured in-depth interviews from 25 academics associated with public and private sector universities in Pakistan. Data is analyzed via thematic analysis. It is found that an ambivalent exists for the implications of AI in an interplay between indigenous knowledge, modernization and academic integrity practices.
The issues that Pakistani society is facing cannot be understood and managed without systematic integration of indigenous knowledge in academic practices. The absence of social science experts from Global South in AI development, AI hallucination, lack of resources in academia and absence of relevant educational policy frameworks are main reasons for challenges. Moreover, a lack of focus in identification, preservation and dissemination of indigenous knowledge in Pakistan has endangered these knowledge streams. The solution is to allocate resources for indigenous knowledge, bridging gaps between social sciences and AI experts, AI literacy amongst the academics and focus on critical AI skills.

Uncritical Reliance on Retraction Watch Database undermines Research on Paper Mills as Limitations are rarely sufficiently addressed

Mr. Tim Kersjes[1]
[1]*Springer Nature, Dordrecht, Netherlands*

Paper mills are a growing threat to the integrity of the published record. Initiatives like United2Act have called out the need for more scholarly research into paper mills. There is already an increase in the number of research articles into paper mills by way of analyzing retracted paper mill articles. These studies rely on the Retraction Watch (RW) Database. RW applies labels to retracted articles as "paper mill" products, and subsequent meta-research frequently treats these classifications as authoritative. However, this practice has serious limitations which are not sufficiently addressed. Retraction notices could mention issues such as compromised peer review or authorship manipulation. This may suggest paper mill involvement, but publishers and editors are usually not able to prove this and therefore would not state paper mill activity publicly. RW appears to apply the "paper mill" label manually, based on internal criteria and RW's own additional investigations. This means that the classification of an article being a paper mill article comes from RW, not from the editor who conducted the actual investigation.

Studies that rely on the RW database without sufficient scrutiny risk basing analyses on assumptions rather than evidence, undermining the validity of claims about patterns in journals or the scale of the paper mill phenomenon.

The implications are significant: without sufficiently addressing these limitations, there is a risk that research on research integrity makes overstated or unreliable claims. This does not only affect the reliability of research integrity but may also perpetuate unreliable and speculative statements about paper mills. This in turn could potentially affect institutional policies, funding policies and research assessment.

In this presentation I will highlight some of the limitations of the Retraction Watch Database. I will show how these limitations are then insufficiently addressed in nearly research articles on paper mills and retractions (only one research article has highlighted the limitations), and how this in turn leads to unreliable claims perpetuating in the scholarly record and in the public discourse on paper mills.

Dynamics of Text Reuse in MDPI Peer Review Reports

Dr. Gilles Hubert[1], *Pr. Cyril Labbé*[2], *Prof. Guillaume Cabanac*[1,3], *Wendeline Swart*[1]
[1]*IRIT - University of Toulouse, Toulouse, France,* [2]*Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LIG, 38000 Grenoble, France,* [3]*Institut universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France*

Objective
Anomalies found in review reports have been observed in previous work. For MDPI, we found nano-sized reports and text reuse among several reports (https://peerreviewcongress.org/?p=3323). This suggests questionable practices from reviewers and poor oversight by editors. Our study aims at studying the timely evolution of text reuse in review reports made available online by MDPI.

Method
For each MDPI article showing a `Review Reports' button, we downloaded the linked HTML page. Note that the downloading is still ongoing; we will update the results upon acceptance. One such page records one or more peer review rounds. We considered `Round 1' only along with their 1+ reports written by the reviewers. We discarded the reports featuring attached files in various formats (e.g., docx, pdf). We designed a text mining process to identify sequences of N+ terms (called chunks) appearing in multiple review reports. We computed yearly descriptive statistics of text reuse in reports. Comparing the figures over years informs us on the evolution of text reuse during peer review, which should be minimal for multiple chunks present in the same report.

Results
As of 15/10/2025, the collected corpus contains 190,174 articles with review reports, published in 383 journals. A total of 500,906 `Round 1' review reports were identified, of which 42,630 (8%) were discarded due to attached files. We textmined the remains of 458,276 searching for reused sequences of 10+ terms. Overall 32% of the reports contained at least one chunk of 10+ terms; 8% with a total chunk size of 50+ terms. With a yearly breakdown, text reuse was higher in 2024 (59%) and rose steadily since 2015. Focusing on total chunk size, text reuse peaked in 2024 (12%).

Conclusion
High levels of text reuse among review reports suggests that reviewers rely increasingly on copy-paste to recycle long passages. The nature of text reuse is uncertain: the necessary personal data to disentangle cases is not available, as most reports are anonymous. Only the publisher can inquire further, using the reviewer identities. Such an audit should foster better education of the reviewers who perform text reuse in their review reports.

Beyond Ghosts: Ethical Dilemmas When Research Contributors Decline Authorship

Dr. Mark Hooper[1], *Dr. Jennifer Wright*[2], *Michael Vincent*[3]
[1]*Tricky Goose Training, Australia,* [2]*Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom,* [3]*University of Queensland, Australia*

To be a legitimate author of a scholarly publication, a person must have at least: (a) made a significant contribution to the research, and (b) agree to be listed as an author and take responsibility for the work. These criteria have been adopted, with minor differences, by national research codes, journals and publishers, research institutions, discipline-specific organisations, and the Committee on Publication Ethics. They are aimed at promoting fairness, transparency and accountability in scholarly publishing.

Our work explores six ethical dilemmas of a very specific and underexplored variety: when a person satisfies the first of these criteria, but not the second. More specifically: when someone has contributed significantly to research but does not (or cannot) agree to be an author.

Existing policies and literature provide inadequate and sometimes contradictory guidance about these cases. This is problematic, since the cases are increasingly common and genuinely difficult to resolve. The stakes are high, because authorship is one of academia's most fundamental mechanisms for proportioning both credit and accountability.

We examine how ethical intuitions pull us in different directions depending on specific facts and assumptions in each case. Our intention is not simply to review the commonly applied 'rules' of authorship, but to scrutinise them. We will argue that a commonly used term, 'ghost authorship', is ambiguous, misleading, and inadequate to explain the range of unethical practices that it is supposed to include. We provide a more nuanced account to guide ethical decision making. We conclude with practical recommendations about research, policies, guidance, and training.

Selective Highlighting in Scholarly Communication: An Emerging Concern for Research Integrity?

Prof. Prakash Hande[1]
[1]*National University of Singapore, Singapore*

Giving proper credit in collaborative research is a cornerstone of responsible conduct and of how science builds trust. We already know the big three when it comes to integrity breaches: plagiarism, fabrication, and falsification. But in practice, there are other behaviours that can quietly distort how credit is seen. One of them is what I call selective highlighting. This happens when a research paper is promoted by congratulating only a few authors—usually from a particular organisation—while the names of other collaborators are hidden, blurred, or simply not mentioned.

At first glance, this might look like a harmless way of showcasing one's own staff. Yet the consequences are not trivial. If some contributors are downplayed or erased, the story of the research is altered. The collective nature of the work disappears, and suspicion can creep into research teams. In a time when social media posts, institutional announcements, and even global benchmarking shape how output is judged, these practices give prestige to a few while overlooking the rest.

This presentation will reflect on why selective highlighting matters. It will place the practice within the wider category of questionable research practices, showing how it differs from—but relates to—more recognised forms of misconduct. It will also suggest that research integrity guidelines should include explicit references to recognition and credit in communication. Fair acknowledgement is not just courtesy. It is necessary to sustain trust, collaboration, and accountability in science.

Improving Acknowledgment Sections to Better Credit Research Contributors

Prof. Alex Holcombe[1], *Dr. Marton Kovacs, Dr. Mátyás Juhász, Wawa Yu*[1], ***Dr. Malgorzata Lagisz***[2,3], *Professor Shinichi Nakagawa*[3], *Dr. Bence Palfi*[4], *Dr. Riva Quiroga*[5]
[1]*University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia,* [2]*Evolution & Ecology Research Centre, School of Biological, Earth & Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales, Kensington Campus, Australia,* [3]*Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada,* [4]*Goldsmiths, University of London, London, United Kingdom,* [5]*OLS, Valparaíso, Chile*

Objective
Today, academic journals rely on an authorship model that includes a strong distinction between author and non-author contributions. One example of this is that authors are indexed in scholarly databases, but those in acknowledgments sections are not, which hampers recognition of their work. We aimed to explore the variety of contributions to the success of scientific projects reported in the acknowledgment statements of publications from a wide array of research fields. Our goal was to consider the potential for future indexing of acknowledgments by databases, and to investigate how well these free-text non-author contributions map onto the 14 roles defined by CRediT.

Method
We obtained acknowledgement sections from over 1.5 million randomly selected journal articles, from the 25 million available records in the Dimensions.ai database. Using machine reading algorithms, we identified named contributors and extracted their contributions. Then, we attempted to classify each contribution statement into one of the 14 CRediT roles. Both extraction and classification models were trained and validated on human-coded data.

Results
Our results indicate that many contributions described in acknowledgements align with CrediT roles and therefore could be captured in scholarly databases, and that many of those align with CRediT. This is unsurprising, as the creators of CRediT examined acknowledgments during development. We also found many contribution types not covered by the 14 CRediT roles. For statements that could not be confidently assigned to existing roles, we propose new potential contributor roles. The patterns of our results varied by scientific discipline.

Conclusions
To improve credit for acknowledged contributors, we propose several incremental reforms. First, journals could include ORCID numbers of acknowledgees in the acknowledgments section. Since some databases already parse these sections, searches for an ORCID could return papers where that person was acknowledged, requiring no journal infrastructure changes. Second, journals could collect acknowledgee identities through structured fields, as they do for authors. This would increase person identification accuracy, and would facilitate automatic emails to acknowledged persons for confirmation, per ICMJE guidelines. Finally, we outline how acknowledged persons could be represented in JATS-XML metadata, including optional CRediT information.

5.B - Oral Session

May 5, 2026, 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM

Integrating Research Security and Research Integrity in International Research Collaborations: Engaged Institutional Policy Development in Japan

Dr Takehito Kamata[1]
[1]*Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan*

Objective
This study aims to establish comprehensive frameworks for integrating research security and research integrity as institutional leadership responsibilities and effective administrative functions in international research collaborations. This study will help stakeholders understand upcoming integration responsibilities and procedures, enabling the creation of effective institutional policies and practical guidelines.

Method
A case study examines the development of institutional research security policies of the nine member universities in the University Research Security and Integrity Consortium “Team Japan” from 2024 to 2025. The study conducts a qualitative analysis of institutional efforts and policies and cross-national policy comparisons to integrate research security and research integrity.

Results
In 2019, the JASON report, commissioned by the National Science Foundation, recommended redefining trusted relationships with collaborating partners abroad. Ongoing dialogue among scientific research, national security, and law enforcement communities is crucial for understanding each other’s objectives, principles, and assumptions in fostering trusted international research collaborations. Under the guidance of the U.S. and Canadian national research security policymakers, the Japanese leaders have advanced policy development procedures since 2024.
Most research security documents and guidelines were developed by national governments that prioritize sensitive technologies based on national interests. Institutions tend to separate research integrity responsibilities, such as addressing misconduct and conflicts of interest, from export control or research security responsibilities.
Ongoing dialogue among scientific research, national security, and law enforcement communities is crucial for understanding each other’s objectives, principles, and assumptions in fostering trusted international research collaborations. Japanese government agencies organized a public symposium aimed at university leaders to discuss research integrity in 2024 and 2025.
Institutional leaders must conduct a thorough assessment of intellectual property concerns, export control regulations, data and publication practices, potential risks to the university and its core values, and the potential repercussions of such actions.

Conclusion
In addition to adhering to national research security guidelines, institutional leaders should also actively engage with counterpart institutions to define research security. Although this study exclusively focused on the policy integration process within the Japanese university consortium, its findings will provide stakeholders with a comprehensive understanding of the forthcoming shared responsibilities in promoting international research collaborations.

Recommendations to Make the Current Research Integrity Framework More Relevant to Processes and Stakeholders in Innovation and Policy Making: The Athens Statement

Dr. Panagiotis Kavouras[1,2], *Dr. Maura Hiney*[3], *Dr. Eleni Spyrakou*[4], *Dr Daniel Barr*[5]
[1]Centre for Medical Ethics, Institute of Health and Society, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, [2]HEAL-Link Office, Library & Information Center, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece, [3]Institute for Discovery, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, [4]RNanoLab, Department of Materials Science and Engineering, School of Chemical Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece, [5]Research and Innovation, RMIT University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Objective
These recommendations seek to improve the relevance of the current Research Integrity (RI) framework, developed during previous World Conferences on Research Integrity (WCRI), for processes and stakeholders involved in (social) innovation and policymaking. They emphasise the importance of communities, such as researchers, research funders, innovators, and policymakers, sharing a common understanding of what is required to create, develop, and apply research findings reliably and responsibly.

Methods
The recommendations were developed through four empirical stages, namely: (1) literature review and 10 structured interviews; (2) feedback received on the 1st draft of recommendations before (via an online questionnaire) and during (via two Focus Tracks) the 8th WCRI; (3) feedback on the 2nd draft of the recommendations via the comCensus platform; and (4) comments on the 3rd draft of the recommendations from experts and members of the Governing Board of the WCRI Foundation. At the time of writing, step 3 was about to commence. The recommendations will be finalised in early 2026.

Results
Recommendations are divided into three sections: (a) RI framework, (b) Openness, transparency, clarity, engagement, and (c) Characteristics of research reliability. The recommendations expand on the principles outlined in the Singapore Statement and the 6th WCRI. They provide high-level guidance on fostering mutual trust and openness among academic, private sector and policy stakeholders. Consequently, the recommendations are aimed at researchers in both academic and non-academic environments, decision-makers in RPOs, research funders, and policymakers.

Conclusion
The recommendations introduce new principles and professional responsibilities “that are fundamental to the integrity of research wherever it is undertaken” (Singapore Statement) and clarify “(h)ow can translational and other users TRUST our research evidence” (6th WCRI). The authors acknowledge the limitations of the study (i.e., participation of predominantly academic respondents and limited representation of private sector and policy stakeholders) but hope that the recommendations will still support the vital work of translating academic research into (social) innovation and policymaking.

Reconsidering Cross-Cultural Collaboration and Indigenous Knowledge Engagement

Dr. Liz Jackson[1], ***Dr. Aleem Bharwani***[2], ***Suha Damag***[3]
[1]*University of Hong Kong,* [2]*University of Calgary,* [3]*University of Lethbridge*

Higher education around the world remains influenced by colonial legacies and hierarchical traditions. As such, universities continue to face challenges supporting equity and diversity. These challenges unfairly impact diverse academics and their opportunities, as well as the capacity of researchers to engage with local communities. Universities are increasingly expected to contribute positively to society. To do this work, universities need to reconsider how they work with local groups. Our research examines how to develop more meaningful cross-cultural collaboration with indigenous and other forms of knowledge in higher education. It considers the nature of an ethical space for communication across worldviews and knowledge systems.

This study stems from the University of Calgary Cumming School of Medicine's Inclusive Governance Model, a co-designed framework that brings together Indigenous Nations, civil society, faculty, staff, and students. This group sought the creation of an ethical space as a collective priority. Building on this consensus, the present study seeks to extend the work of this model by identifying, co-creating, and embedding principles, commitments, and practices that sustain ethical space in higher education in other institutions. More specifically, this project considers how the insights of the Calgary model can be applied to enhance research collaboration at the University of Hong Kong, in line with the importance of diversity, fairness, and respect for indigenous knowledge. It aims to articulate principles, commitments, and practices that sustain ethical space in higher education and develop a roadmap for governance transformation that embeds these commitments into institutional practices.

This presentation focuses on the first step of this global comparative project. It includes a transdisciplinary narrative review that draws from Indigenous teachings, community knowledge, and other literature and a comparative assessment of perspectives and challenges faced in higher education in Calgary versus Hong Kong. As such, this project provides a foundation for the comparative articulation of how ethical space can be practically enacted across world regions, emerging through mutual recognition across worldviews and contributing to equity and impactful knowledge production in higher education.

Integrity of Science in Collision with Political Interest: A Challenge in Collaborative Research with Indigenous Communities

Prof. Carl Walter Matthias Kaiser[1,2], *Dr. Marjo Rauhala*[3], *Dr. Vasiliki Mollaki*[4], *Mr Anders Oskal*[5], *Dr. Svein Disch Mathiesen*[6], *Dr. Mimi E. Lam*[1]

[1]University of Bergen, SVT, Bergen, Norway, [2]Norwegian Institute for Sustainability Research NORSUS, Fredrikstad, Norway, [3]Technical University of Vienna, Wien, Austria, [4]National Centre for Scientific Research: Demokritos, Athens, Greece, [5]International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry, Kautokeino, Norway, [6]Saami University of Applied Science, Kautokeino, Norway

The recognition of still dominant traces of post-colonial structures in scientific research has led to an effort to recognize and value indigenous knowledge traditions. The basic ethical commitment behind this effort is the explicit respect for the rights and insights of these indigenous communities to contribute to truly collaborative research, for instance in what is now termed transdisciplinary research. However, this kind of research often centres around socially and politically highly contentious issues, with a diversity of interests at stake. On the basis of experience with a number of such projects and debates (from Canada, Norway and New Zealand) the authors content that the integrity standards of science may be too easily sacrificed to the articulated interests of the collaborating indigenous community. Questions focus on the ownership of the data, the analysis and interpretation of them, and the ensuing communication and publication of them. Equality in research partnership should not grant rights to the exploitation of the research to political community interests, whether they be from the indigenous community or from the surrounding non-indigenous authorities or society. Behind this is the relationship between knowledge and action, and in extension the problematic role as science advocacy (or even survival science) as opposed to what Pielke calls the Honest Broker of Science. There is an implicit tension behind all of this. While we have come to realize that pure objectivity in science is a part of an ideology which we definitely should give up and rather embrace the notion that science and values are inherently intertwined, the extreme alternative of science advocacy will undermine the trust in science, and thus also affect transdisciplinary research with indigenous communities. This talk will outline some rarely explicitly endorsed conditions which safeguard the integrity of the scientists and respect the rights and interests of indigenous communities. Clear contractual conditions and mechanisms such as narrative ethical scenario exercises (as articulated in the CHANGER project) will be among those instruments. The point must be for the sciences not to be seen as mere instruments for specific political interests.

Advancing Opportunities for Indigenous-Inclusive Science and Innovation: Practical Approaches to Indigenous Research and Engagement

Mr. Evan Laye[1], ***Mrs. Natalie Collins***[1], ***Ms. Lisa Dixon***[1]
[1]*National Research Council Canada, Canada*

The National Research Council (NRC) partners with Canadian industry to advance science and innovation across the country. Grounded in values of integrity, excellence, respect, and creativity, the NRC sets out to advance knowledge, apply leading-edge technologies, and work with innovators to find creative, relevant, and sustainable solutions to Canada's current and future economic, social, and environmental challenges.

In 2022, the National Research Council (NRC) established its first Indigenous Engagement Advisor position, leading to the development of the NRC's Indigenous Strategy & Engagement Team (ISET). Over the summer of 2022, ISET engaged with leadership within the NRC's 12 Research Centers to identify opportunities for amplifying Indigenous-led and co-developed research projects. Based on these discussions, there existed a need for support and practical guidance on engaging with Indigenous partners within a multi-disciplinary research organization. The NRC's ISET developed key resources for planning engagement activities with Indigenous collaborators, which focused on building capacity cultural awareness, cultural protocols and case-study examples of appropriate and effective co-development approaches. To deliver this guidance into practice, ISET developed a series of workshop modules that translated the written materials into interactive, discussion-based exercises in order to equip NRC researchers with the knowledge and skills to support their collaboration with Indigenous groups. This workshop was designed to be dynamic, and can be tailored to individual research centers and their respective disciplinary areas.

The approach taken by the NRC to develop this resource is intended to deliver practical, effective, culturally-appropriate guidance to a diverse suite of audiences. The story of NRC's journey in supporting Indigenous research may be valuable to other groups seeking to build similar functions/capacity within their organizations.

Review Arena: A Living, AI-assisted Systematic Review of Experiments Benchmarking AI for Research Evaluation

Mr. Jay Patel[1], *Joel Chan*[1]
[1]*University Of Maryland - College Park, USA*

Objective
As formal peer review is being strained in scholarly societies and journals, researchers and developers have proposed using large language models (LLMs) and pretrained language models (PLMs) to evaluate submissions alongside or instead of humans. They enthusiastically claim that AI-assisted research evaluation can match or exceed human performance, in sharp contrast to skeptics who passionately decry them for their inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and occasionally incoherent replies. Here, we focus on contrasting model performance and ask: How accurately and efficiently can individual AI systems evaluate study reports relative to human experts in benchmarking experiments?

Method
In our living synthesis, we are screening all high-quality experiments in which LLMs and PLMs were evaluated against humans on closed-ended evaluation tasks (e.g., reporting guideline verification, risk of bias assessment, and compliance with research ethics principles) and open-ended ones like fraud/error detection, the enumeration of limitations, and minimally structured peer review. We searched scholarly databases and search engines using keywords for benchmarking experiments in which one or more models competed against human experts to evaluate research. After database searches, we searched AI-driven academic search engines like Elicit (elicit.org, Pro version) and Undermind (undermind.ai, Pro version). To weigh the best evidence more strongly, we assessed study quality using our newly developed AI benchmarking experiment quality appraisal tool. Thus far, we have identified n = 51 study reports for inclusion and 5 low-quality studies for exclusion.

Results
Now, we are evaluating and synthesizing the results in an open wiki in which anyone can suggest updates. Synthesizing across 107 discrete empirical results extracted from the literature, we conclude that (1) nearly all AI systems lag behind human experts to varying degrees, (2) AI systems are more accurate when fine-tuned on specific datasets, (3) retrieval augmented generation (RAG) boosts accuracy rates, (4) closed-ended tasks are easier for AI systems to complete, as does (5) engineering prompts with relevant examples.

Conclusion
Our continued efforts will inform us of what AI systems can truly do and offer those who debate their value a shared evidence base to reason from and contribute to.

Comprehensive Benchmarking of AI Models for Assessing Reporting Transparency in Randomized Controlled Trials

Ms. Shiwei Liu[1], *Lan Jiang*[1], *Gibong Hong*[1], *Joe Menke*[1], *Ms. Mengfei Lan*[1], *Halil Kilicoglu*[1]
[1]*University of Illinois Urbana Champaign, Champaign, USA*

Objective
Transparent reporting of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) is vital to research integrity. Despite journal endorsement of reporting guidelines (SPIRIT for protocols, CONSORT for trial results publications), adherence to these standards remains inadequate. Although AI models are increasingly proposed to automate this task, comprehensive benchmarking across AI models is lacking. We present a benchmarking study of AI models for assessing RCT compliance with these guidelines.

Methods
We fine-tuned three encoder models (PubMedBERT, BioLinkBERT-Large, DeBERTa-v3-Large), one encoder-decoder model (SciFive-Large), and one non-transformer model (TextCNN) on SPIRIT-CONSORT-TM, an annotated corpus of 200 RCT protocols and trial results publications. We also evaluated three large language models (LLMs) (OpenAI GPT-5, Microsoft Phi-4) in zero-shot mode and a smaller reasoning model (OpenAI o3-mini). Model performance (precision, recall, F1) was measured at sentence and article level for SPIRIT, CONSORT, and consolidated SPIRIT-CONSORT checklists and 95% CIs were calculated.

Results
Fine-tuned encoder models outperformed others at sentence-level detection. On the consolidated checklist, PubMedBERT achieved the highest F1 (harmonic mean of precision and recall) (0.742 [0.741-0.744]) followed by BioLinkBERT-Large (0.729 [0.713-0.739]), and DeBERTa-v3-Large (0.708 [0.694-0.722]). PubMedBERT also led on SPIRIT (0.748 [0.745-0.751]) and CONSORT (0.748 [0.744-0.751]). SciFive-Large and TextCNN were substantially lower (0.559 [0.555-0.562], 0.536 [0.525-0.542]). SciFive-Large yielded higher precision (0.601 [0.581-0.630]), TextCNN higher recall (0.585 [0.573-0.611]).

At the article level, encoder-only models showed high precision (PubMedBERT > 0.90 cross all checklists) with few false positives and strong F1 on consolidated: BioLinkBERT-Large (0.879 [0.832-0.902]), PubMedBERT (0.865 [0.862-0.867]), DeBERTa-v3-Large (0.856 [0.833-0.883]).

Among zero-shot LLMs, o3-mini achieved the highest article-level F1 (0.891 [0.873-0.932]) on consolidated, slightly exceeding fine-tuned models, though not surpass them on CONSORT/SPIRIT subsets. GPT-5 reached F1 0.824 [0.816-0.829] but remained below the fine-tuned encoders, and Phi-4 trailed (0.729 [0.725-0.732]). LLMs were significantly less accurate than fine-tuned encoder models at sentence level.

Conclusion
This first comprehensive benchmarking evaluation shows that zero-shot LLMs approach fine-tuned models for article-level screening (item reported or not), but domain-specific fine-tuned encoder models better pinpoint exact relevant sentences. Using fine-tuned domain-specific encoder models for detailed evidence and LLMs for rapid screening: tools built on such insights can reduce reporting omissions and strengthen RCT reporting.

Exploring Facilitators and Barriers to the Implementation of Research Reproducibility Measures and Interventions: A Focus Group Study

Miss Dora Pejdo[1], *Ms Simiao Yu*[2], *Dr. Tamarinde Haven*[2], *Assistant Professor Ivan Buljan*[3], *Prof. Ana Marušić*[1], *Dr Florence Bietrix*[4]
[1]*University Of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia,* [2]*Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands,* [3]*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Split, Croatia,* [4]*European Infrastructure for Translational Medicine (EATRIS), Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Objective
The study aims to explore facilitators and barriers to interventions and reproducibility measures that could improve research reproducibility across scientific disciplines. By engaging different stakeholders, we seek to identify different aspects to implementation of these practices.

Methods
This qualitative study employs focus groups to gather perspectives from five stakeholder categories: researchers and their organisations, funders, policymakers, editors, and publishers. A minimum of ten focus groups will be conducted, with up to eight participants per group. Discussions are audio-recorded, transcribed, and analysed thematically using Braun and Clarke's six-phase approach in NVivo. Participants will be recruited purposively to ensure diversity in geography, research discipline, and involvement in research integrity issues.

Results
Data collection is currently ongoing, with eight focus groups conducted to date. The analysis of the first two focus groups indicates that the participants recognised the complexity of improving reproducibility and emphasised the need for shared responsibility across the scientific ecosystem. The list of provided interventions and reproducibility measures from the previous Delphi consultation was viewed from multiple perspectives, as these interventions and measures appear not to be equally supported for implementation across stakeholder groups. The results from all focus groups will be synthesised into a framework offering practical guidance for institutions, journals, and funders.

Conclusion
The full analysis will be ready by May 2026. This study will contribute empirical evidence to inform policies and practices that foster reproducible research. By integrating perspectives from multiple stakeholder groups, it will generate recommendations to strengthen research culture and accountability for reproducible research.

Accidental Watermarking: A Novel Method for Detecting Potential RCT Paper Mill Products

*Dr. Dan Sprague[1,4], Mr. Matthew Jané[1,3], **Dr. James Heathers**[1,2]*
[1]The Medical Evidence Project, New York, USA, [2]Linnaeus University, Växjö, Sweden, [3]University of Connecticut, Mansfield, USA, [4]Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, USA

Objective
Previous approaches to identify paper mill products have generally relied on either co-located elements (Western blots, micrographs, data structures) which are duplicated within or across multiple papers or grammatically unusual features ('tortured phrases'). However, neither element is typically present in medical research papers.

Here we share a novel and distinct approach for locating papers with a common textural source (and, potentially, paper mill products) via accidental watermarking.

Methods
We can assume (a) fabricated papers are prepared from a long and complicated template, (b) this template will contain distinct grammatical or typographical features, and (c) these will be only partially or selectively redacted by copy editors.

To prepare a list of 'watermarked' papers, we manually gathered a list of 20 very minor but unusual textural similarities from a cohort of 18 papers sent by an anonymous correspondent to the Medical Evidence Project because of questions about their veracity, combined searches of these through a commercial Google Scholar API service, removed duplicate results, and combined these into a network graph to reveal the common authors, citation structure, and publication patterns.

Results
The initial analysis identified 280 papers, of which 212 were papers of interest (RCTs which covered three primary subject areas in medicine). Publications with similar features were observed across several major publishers (Elsevier, Frontiers, Nature, Wolters Kluwer, Springer, Taylor and Francis, Wiley). 81 out of 82 papers with multiple flags were on an identical topic. The most prolific journal contained 89 publications distributed evenly across 11 calendar years. Papers displayed substantial overlap in their internal structure and layout. Spot-checks revealed some unlikely methodological data features and graphical errors.

Conclusion
If a sufficient series of textual flags can be initially identified, this method of anomaly detection can be iterated (flags -> papers -> flags). Fully developed, it is likely cheaper, more flexible, and more capable of automation than existing methods. It can potentially be applied to any academic area reporting complex text, regardless of the presence of duplicated images or nonsensical language.

Enhancing the Responsible Use of AI in Research through Game-Based Learning

Dr. Willie Koh[1], *Dr. Aihua Hou*[1]
[1]*Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

The rapid adoption of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has significantly improved the quality and efficiency of research. However, it has also introduced complex challenges to research integrity, including concerns about originality, transparency, accountability, and potential issues related to plagiarism and authorship. Despite the publication of policies on AI-use by academic publishers and institutions, researchers often remain uncertain about how to use GenAI responsibly across different stages of the research lifecycle as policies, guidelines and online learning are largely passive and fail to engage researchers.

Game-based learning is widely recognized as an effective approach to engage learners in reflective thinking and reasoning, thereby deepening their understanding of complex topics. This study aims to develop and evaluate a game-based learning tool designed to promote the responsible use of AI in research. The interactive game will immerse players in realistic research scenarios that require decision-making on use of AI in contexts such as literature reviews and data analysis. Following gameplay, participants will complete a survey assessing whether the experience enhanced their knowledge, ethical awareness, and sensitivity to potential misconduct.

We anticipate that this game will contribute to ongoing efforts to strengthen research integrity education and provide an innovative model for fostering responsible research practices in the era of AI.

Ethics of Using AI Agents in Research

Dr. Mohammad Hosseini[1], *Dr. David Resnik*[2], *Dr. Rico Hauswald*[3]
[1]*Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, USA,* [2]*National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Durham, USA,* [3]*Dresden University of Technology, Dresden, Germany*

Objective
This talk will explore ethical implications of using artificial intelligence (AI) agents in research. AI agents can be connected to other resources like datasets, repositories and robots, and can autonomously conduct research. Explored questions will include: Which ethical values and principles of science are threatened by AI agents? How should we use AI agents responsibly to avoid erosion of public trust?

Methods
Our guiding assumptions are: 1) AI systems employed in scientific research are becoming increasingly competent, sophisticated, and autonomous. AI agents are the latest example; and 2) Unless humans intervene, soon, AI agents will function as independent investigators with expertise and skills on par with or exceeding human researchers' capabilities in various domains.

Results
Most AI tools function under direct supervision and control of researchers. However, with the introduction of AI agents, AI integration in research is entering a new phase and affecting ethical values and principles of science. Some of the potential ethical issues raised by the participation of AI agents in research include: 1) Conducting immoral research that may harm humans and other forms of life; 2) Increasing rate of biased, erroneous and deceptive research; 3) Confidentiality challenges; 4) Overreliance on AI; 5) Diffusion of responsibility and accountability; 6) Deskilling; 7) Job losses; 8) AI-generated research beyond human comprehension; and 9) Erosion of trust.

Conclusion
For each of the discussed challenges, we offer a specific solution: 1) Human oversight and control of AI-generated questions, hypotheses, aims, and objectives; 2) Human review and auditing of AI research, AI review and audit of AI research, disclosure of AI use in research; 3) Standard measures for protecting confidentiality and security of data; integration of privacy protection principles into AI systems; 4) Humans have active involvement and vigilance in AI-augmented research; 5) Clearly define and maintain research roles and responsibilities; 6) Maintain and develop essential human research skills; 7) Retrain displaced human workers; 8) Regulate and control the development of highly advanced AI systems; 9) Pursue different methods for assuring trustworthy AI appropriate to the stage of development, including verification, explanation, audits, and independent reviews.

Using Data-Driven Technology to Identify and Resolve Signals of Ethical Misconduct Prior to Publication

Dr. Angela Seggio - Welch[1], *Elavenhil Pallipatti Mohan*[2], *Stacy King*[3]

[1]Research Integrity & Publishing Ethics Center of Expertise, Elsevier, New York, USA, [2]Research Integrity & Publishing Ethics Center of Expertise, Elsevier, Chennai, India, [3]Research Integrity & Publishing Ethics Center of Expertise, Elsevier, London, UK

There is an unprecedented increase in coordinated misconduct across the scholarly publishing industry. According to the Retraction Watch database, retractions have increased fourfold from 2015 to 2024, reaching a peak of 13,411 articles retracted worldwide in 2023. This rise is primarily driven by ethical misconduct at various stages of the publication process, including citation manipulation, unauthorized authorship changes, and conflicts of interest. The growth of paper mills and predatory publishing further intensify this problem. These practices undermine the integrity of scientific research and risk eroding public trust in science.

The Problem

Given the enormous volume of articles published in recent years—in 2022 alone, over 2.82 million papers were indexed by Scopus and Web of Science–it is impossible to rely on manual screening techniques alone to detect ethical breaches. Employing innovative, data-driven tools is crucial to proactively identify unethical manuscripts at the editorial stage and prevent publication.

Our Solution

Based on analyses of post-publication investigations, our research integrity and publication ethics team has identified 130 signals to detect potential misconduct. Our team is developing a pre-publication integrity screening tool to detect signals at key points throughout manuscript evaluation. Integrity signals are grouped by ecosystems of misconduct, prioritized for development based on significance and potential impact on journals, and then deployed in phased releases to our journals. Manuscripts flagged by the tool are validated by a team of 50 integrity screening specialists following established protocols.

Results

The “minimal viable product” tool was launched in 2024 and has been deployed to nearly 65% of Elsevier’s journals to date. Manuscripts submitted to these journals are automatically screened for authorship changes, editorial conflicts of interest, and signals of citation manipulation. Over one year, more than 3 million submissions have been vetted, surfacing 39,000 manuscripts with concerns, thereby supporting the prevention of potential future retractions related to the above-mentioned misconduct.

Next Steps

Other signal ecosystems are currently in development, and we aim to roll out additional research integrity signals and tool functionality throughout 2026.

The Future of Integrity: Human Connection in an AI-Driven World

Mr. Christopher Rickerby[1], *Bernd Pulverer*[1]
[1]*EMBO Press - European Molecular Biology Organization, Heidelberg, Germany*

This presentation explores how combining an integrity screening pipeline based on an artificial intelligence-enhanced toolkit with a mandate for open science data posting, scientific expert assessment, and direct interaction with authors can strengthen quality control in scientific publishing.

At EMBO Press, pre-publication integrity screening combines AI-assisted image and data checks with assessment by scientific editors and direct communication between editors and authors. Using a three-tier classification system adopted by STM as a publishing standard, we identify moderate and severe integrity issues and invite authors to brief online calls to discuss findings and clarify the context.

The EMBO Press workflow integrates three key innovations. First, Source Data posting and Structured Methods promote transparency and allow for thorough verification of integrity issues and assessing the scientific impact. Second, integrity discussions between data analysts and scientific editors ensure that the impact of any irregularity is assessed in the context of the research. Third, direct conversations with authors resolve many issues more efficiently than extended correspondence and provide valuable insight into research practices and awareness of integrity standards. Together, these three elements have improved the accuracy and efficiency of pre- and post-publication screening while fostering a culture of openness and collaboration. Authors appreciate the opportunity to clarify their data, and editors gain a clearer understanding of intent, accountability, and the scientific process.

In a world that is becoming increasingly automated, it is worth remembering that human connection still holds great value. At EMBO Press, we have found that pairing technology with open dialogue produces stronger outcomes and a deeper sense of integrity. The future of research integrity may depend as much on how we talk to one another as on the tools we use to detect what has gone wrong.

A Dataset of 2,219 Text-Based Paper Mill Advertisements with 16,474 Timestamped Prices

Dr. Reese Richardson[1], *Dr. Spencer Hong*[1]
[1]*Northwestern University, Evanston, USA*

Objective
The study of paper mills and similar businesses operating in the market for academic and education fraud services is frustrated by the lack of market price data on their various offerings.

Methods
We collected text-based advertisements made in private group "channels" on messaging app Telegram from three businesses based in India, Iraq and Uzbekistan. Message metadata and prices were extracted from these messages using a combination of automated and manual extraction and validation. To allow for quantitative analysis of these datasets, we provide the text of these advertisements with business names, websites, phone numbers, social media links and individuals' names redacted.

Results
We assemble a large, annotated dataset of timestamped, text-based paper mill advertisements from three different businesses operating out of three different countries. The dataset consists of 2,219 individual advertisements, of which 998 have prices listed. Among these there are 2,787 positions listed as for sale on 914 unique products in 13 different product categories, amounting to 16,747 timestamped price data points. Product categories include article authorship positions, textbook authorship and editorships and applicant positions on utility patents and design registrations. Exploratory data analysis demonstrates that prices can fluctuate considerably over time, even for the same products, and can vary wildly across different markets and contexts, even when offered by the same business.

Conclusion
Here, we provide a first-of-its-kind, rich annotated dataset of paper mill advertisements. Future studies using this dataset might interrogate how prices vary based on the perceived quality of product being offered (e.g., indexing status or ranking of a journal), based on perceived reward for purchasing the product (e.g., by linking the dataset with corresponding points-based metrics in widely adopted institutional tenure and promotion criteria) or based on discipline. Publishers might also use this dataset to augment internal assessments of their portfolios' exposure to paper mill operations (similar to how previous works have linked paper mill advertisements to eventually published articles).

Navigating Dual Imperatives: Safeguarding Research in the Pursuit of Global Engagement

Dr. Clayton Lewis[1]
[1]*University Of Calgary, Calgary, Canada*

Canadian research and innovation are fueled by open scholarship and international collaboration. Yet, with the introduction of new research security requirements for Canadian researchers, international collaborations are subject to increased scrutiny. This gives rise to a potential dilemma – on the one hand, the open and collaborative nature of Canada's research ecosystem makes it vulnerable to foreign interference and theft. On the other hand, the over-securitization of research risks hindering the international collaborations that drive knowledge and discovery. This talk explores how the dual imperatives of safeguarding research and pursuing international partnerships can be reconciled. Best practices will be highlighted on how postsecondary institutions can approach secure research as a necessary condition for global engagement and internationalization, rather than an impediment. We will look at ways that Research Security and International Offices can coordinate their efforts to ensure a secure research environment when hosting international delegations, presenting research data, and pursuing potential research partnerships. By approaching safeguarding research as a means to deepening global impact through internationalization, universities can ensure that research and innovation continue to make a positive impact at home and abroad.

Self-Citation Patterns Among Researchers

Dr. Mihaela-Alina Coste[1], ***Dr. Leslie Mcintosh***[1]
[1]*Digital Science, London, United Kingdom*

Objective
The landscape of academic publishing is complex, and self-citation is an interesting aspect of scholarly communication. While a degree of self-citation is expected as researchers build on their existing body of work, excessive self-referencing can, in some cases, obscure the true impact of research. On the other hand, a complete absence of self-referencing could also raise concerns, particularly for a scholar with an extensive publication history. We investigated self-citation patterns to distinguish between legitimate scholarly continuity and practices that may indicate integrity concerns, analyzing how self-citation varies across academic disciplines and career stages.

Methods
This bibliometric analysis utilized data from Dimensions, covering a population of over 5.4 million active researchers. Authors whose last year to publish was 2023 or later and had a minimum of five publications where the paper had nine or more references were selected. Self-citation was defined at the paper level as any reference with at least one author in common between the citing and cited publications, encompassing both direct and collaborative self-citation. Researchers were assigned to a single self-citing publications threshold based on the share of their publications that include at least one self-citation: 0% (no self-citations), <25%, 25–50%, 50–75%, or >75%.

Results
Our findings confirm a clear split between disciplines. Self-citation is a near-universal norm in STEM, where in many core sciences over 80% of researchers have self-citations in the majority of their work. This is in stark contrast to the Humanities, where the practice is far less common, with many fields like Law and Philosophy showing that less than 40% of researchers exhibit the same high self-citation behavior. Although a complete absence of self-citation is rare across all fields (observed in only 2% of researchers), this pattern is particularly anomalous among experienced researchers or those in STEM fields.

Conclusion
Self-citation is governed by disciplinary norms and career stage, not universal standards. High self-citation is standard in STEM fields, while lower rates are typical in the humanities. Significant deviations from these established norms, particularly among experienced researchers, may signal potential integrity issues as we expect work to be built upon prior research.

Embedding an Informal Component into IRB Practice

Dr. Yaryna Pikulytska[1]
[1]*Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, Ukraine*

Ukraine is a country where ethical review of research was implemented because of changing policies around the world. After being under the Soviet Union for approximately 70 years, Ukraine inherited significant legal and ethical oversight as a heavy heritage from the Soviets upon its independence. Thus, neither research as a classical form of education through medical school has yet been implemented in education, nor is ethical oversight in place. Being a physician facing ethical challenges every day, I delved into bioethics as a discipline more than 7 years ago at the Ukrainian Catholic University (UCU). Being involved in the Faculty of Health Sciences, the need for ethical oversight was articulated from within (when researchers are conducting research) and from without (when they want to publish). It was the reason why, with the team of the School of Bioethics, we established the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Establishing and building the processes was only the first step. The attitude to the IRB as a formal board for publishing was the new challenge we needed to resolve. Thus, the new goal was to make the IRB the center of research integrity, as it provides formal and informal education, workshops, and guidance for conducting research ethically. To make this goal more practical and less formal, the idea is to involve researchers from the institution in IRB procedures as consultants and drivers for creating training materials based on current or near-future needs. The idea was based on the history of bioethics when the need for answering the dilemmas was the driver for seeking the answers out of existing knowledge.

I argue that IRB should have its formal function. However, in the formalism, there is a risk of being far from reality and, at any moment, failing to fulfill the function of real ethical oversight it is meant to satisfy. It is the reason why the IRB should include an informal component, involving researchers as drivers to resolve challenges they encounter while conducting research.

Algorithmic Assumptions: The Ethics of Using AI and Other Tools to Infer Demographics from Names in Social Science and Medical Research

Dr. Julia Gunn[1], *Dr. Julia Gunn*[2]

[1]*University of Oxford, United Kingdom,* [2]*Taylor & Francis Group, United States*

Objectives

Tools that infer gender or race from names—whether powered by artificial intelligence or static databases—are increasingly used by researchers across a range of disciplines. While efficient, these tools raise serious ethical and methodological concerns. Prior studies (e.g., Kozlowski et al., 2022; Lockhart et al., 2023) show that name-based demographic inference tools (NDITs) often oversimplify or misclassify individuals, embedding cultural assumptions that can distort findings and perpetuate bias.

This study examines published research in the medical and social sciences to discover whether and how researchers describe the use of NDITs, in particular their justification, selection, limitations, and potential impacts. The aim is to understand how NDITs intersect with considerations of research integrity, transparency, reproducibility, and rigour.

Methods

We are conducting a cross-sectional analysis of peer-reviewed articles published since 2024 that employ NDITs such as NamePrism, Namsor, Gender API, Genderize, and Nyckel. Using a six-item reporting index, we assess whether researchers (1) justify using inferred data over self-reported; (2) explain their tool choice; (3) specify data sources or versions; (4) cite validation or error rates; (5) discuss limitations or biases; and (6) describe how inferred data featured in analyses. Analysis is ongoing; full results to be presented at WCRI.

Results

Early findings suggest a proliferation of NDITs, but reporting is inconsistent and often opaque. Many studies fail to explain the tool selection process adequately, and rarely specify error rates, data sources, or other methodological constraints. This lack of transparency not only undermines reproducibility but also raises ethical concerns, particularly when results based on inference inform analyses of inequality, guide interventions, or shape policy recommendations.

Conclusion

Rather than rejecting demographic inference tools outright, we propose an integrity-focused framework emphasizing transparency and accountability. Journals, publishers, and institutional ethics committees should consider requiring (1) explicit reporting of demographic inference methods; (2) justification for using inferred rather than self-identified demographic data; and (3) discussion of known biases, error rates, and limitations. As demographic inference tools become more widespread, adopting such measures will help ensure the responsible use of AI and prevent uncritical reliance on NDITs from amplifying the very inequities researchers aim to measure.

The Updated Ottawa Statement on the Ethical Design and Conduct of Cluster Randomized Trials

Dr. Cory Goldstein[1,2], *Dr. Monica Taljaard*[1,2], *Prof. Charles Weijer*[3]
[1]*Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada,* [2]*University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [3]*Western University, London, Canada*

Background
Cluster randomized trials (CRTs) are increasingly used to evaluate health interventions. However, CRTs raise complex ethical issues. Published in 2012, the Ottawa Statement on the Ethical Design and Conduct of CRTs remains the only international ethics guidance document specific to CRTs. Yet novel CRT designs, increasing use of CRTs to address pragmatic questions, and the growing role of participant and community engagement in CRTs have created a need for a comprehensive update of the Ottawa Statement.

Objective
To outline the rationale and development process of, and major revisions to the Ottawa Statement.

Methods
To identify gaps in the Ottawa Statement, our research team started by conducting conceptual research (e.g., analysis of healthcare provider involvement in CRTs) and empirical research (e.g., citation analysis, systematic reviews). The results of these studies informed our extensive, multi-year consensus process involving more than 30 ethicists, methodologists, trialists, and patient and community partners across five continents. Before each consensus meeting, the core team met with a small group of volunteers to review one domain of the original Ottawa Statement, identify key issues and relevant literature, and, where applicable, propose potential solutions. The core team then met with our patient and community partners to answer questions about the domain and solicit feedback. The entire team subsequently met to discuss proposed revisions. The core team then circulated revised text to the entire team for written feedback, and this process was repeated until all domains of the Ottawa Statement were reviewed and consensus was reached.

Results
The updated Ottawa Statement offers expanded guidance on key ethical domains, including research ethics committee review, justifying the use of cluster randomization, identifying research participants, obtaining informed consent, gatekeepers, benefit-harm analysis, and protecting vulnerable participants. It also introduces new guidance on novel CRT designs, pragmatism, and participant and community engagement in CRTs.

Conclusion
The combination of conceptual and empirical research provided the consensus process with a solid foundation to help ensure the updated Ottawa Statement is reasonably comprehensive. The new and revised recommendations provide clear guidance to assist researchers and researcher ethics committees with the rapidly evolving ethical challenges of CRTs globally.

A National Recommendation to Support Ethical Use of AI in Research: The Finnish Case

*Dr Iina Kohonen[1], **Dr. Petra Falin**[1], Dr. Simo Kyllönen[2], Mr Kalle Videnoja[1]*
[1]Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, Helsinki, Finland, [2]University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

This presentation examines Finland's experience in drafting a national recommendation on the ethical use of artificial intelligence (AI) in research. The case offers practical lessons for those developing similar national ethical guidance elsewhere.

The initiative was led by the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (TENK), an expert body under the Ministry of Education and Culture. The purpose of the recommendation is to support researchers and research ethics committees (boards) to recognize the risks associated with AI related research and help to plan ethically acceptable research designs that utilize AI with integrity.

TENK has a longstanding mandate to promote research integrity and provide national guidance on research ethics. The drafting process included broad and structured consultation: open workshops, hearings with researchers across disciplines, targeted discussions with publishers and ethical committees. Key stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft.

This participatory process ensured that the resulting recommendation reflected the diverse needs and concerns of the research community, including questions of authorship, transparency in the use of generative AI, reliability of data, and the protection of research participants' rights.

The recommendation has been designed as a living document, allowing for iterative updates as technologies and research practices evolve. It is positioned within existing national frameworks and complements TENK's The Finnish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity and its guidelines on Ethical Review in the Human Sciences. At the same time, it aligns with EU regulations and institutional policies, ensuring consistency across levels of governance.

The presentation introduces the Finnish system and the role of the national recommendation in the Finnish research integrity landscape between the international and the organisational guidance and legislation. The presentation also frames the key research integrity issues and ethical concerns outlined in the recommendation. It also highlights key achievements of the process, such as broad stakeholder engagement and systematic identification of ethical risks, while also discussing challenges, including reconciling disciplinary differences and addressing rapidly shifting technological contexts.

The Third Space: Challenges Identified and Lessons Learned from reviewing Ethics Applications involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research

Dr. Misty Fish[1]
[1]*Curtin University, Bentley, Australia*

In Australia, it could be viewed that institutions are working in a third space when involved with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research. The third space in its simplest form can be described as the coming together of culture and law of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. The intention of third space discussion in this presentation is the bringing together of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ways of knowing, being and doing, with that of non-Indigenous operational ways of working relating to governance and policy implementation in the university sector.

This brief presentation is focused on highlighting some challenges identified when assessing and reviewing ethics applications involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research, and how this in turn can impact the way responsible research practices are viewed. When working in the third space, without appropriate understanding of Indigenous ways of knowing, being and doing, it may be difficult for reviewers to understand how to courageously and respectfully review applications, and it is proposed there should be a merging of ideas to have better outcomes for the people who the research should benefit and the people who are asking for the research to be done.

The intention of the presentation is to put forward challenges which have been identified in a Research Integrity Office, involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research projects, viewed through the lens of a non-Indigenous person. The aim of the presentation is to open conversation and discuss solutions to improve understanding and reciprocity for all those involved.

The presentation will conclude with some lessons learned and considerations for how Ethics and Research Integrity Officers can better work together with Indigenous Researchers, Community and non-Indigenous researchers, to improve responsiveness, respect and understanding for all those working in this research area.

Lessons Learned for Research Ethics and Integrity from the COVID-19 Pandemic

Dr Natalie Evans[1], *Dr. Langelihle Mlotshwa*[2], *Dr. Giulia Inguaggiato*[1], *Dr Michelle Singh*[3], *Ms Carly Seedall*[4], *Mr Kalle Videnoja*[5]
[1]*Amsterdam Umc, Amsterdam, Netherlands,* [2]*University of the Witwatersrand, Witwatersrand, South Africa,* [3]*European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership, Cape Town, South Africa,* [4]*European Network of Research Ethics Committees, Bonn, Germany,* [5]*The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, Helsinki, Finland*

Objective
The PREPARED Code of Conduct for Research during Pandemics has been developed based on real global challenges experienced during the pandemic. As part of broad engagement activities, we explored the experiences and perspectives of key experts on research ethics and integrity during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods
Online focus groups were conducted (Sept '23 – Nov '24) with five key research stakeholder groups, (i) policymakers, (ii) ethics experts, iii) integrity experts, iv) senior researchers, and v) European patient advocates. Experts were purposively recruited to reflect diverse perspectives. Cross-cutting themes were developed via a thematic analysis combining deductive and inductive approaches.

Results
24 experts participated from 17 countries. The resultant cross-cutting themes were: 1) primacy of public engagement, communication and trust; 2) prioritization of biomedical knowledge; 3) exposure of global research injustice; 4) exacerbation of pre-existing research integrity problems, and acceleration of solutions; and 5) weaknesses in research governance preparedness. These themes appeared in all expert discussions, though their emphasis varied.
All experts emphasized the importance of engagement for understanding the public perspective, including livelihood concerns, and to build trust in public health interventions. The increased visibility of some researchers, due to advisory roles or public communication, created specific challenges which scientists were inadequately trained for. Patient advocates described barriers to understanding scientific communication and health risk. Senior researchers emphasized the dominance of biomedical knowledge in policymaking and pandemic response, whilst insights from social science and the humanities were less valued. All experts grappled with justice concerns, focusing on disproportionate research burdens on lower socio-economic groups and low- and middle income countries, and unfair distribution of research benefits. Integrity experts stated that challenges experienced were not new, but more pronounced and urgent during the pandemic, however approaches to improve research quality and transparency became more mainstream. Ethics committee members and policy makers reported a lack of operational guidance, coordination, and resources to function under crisis conditions.

Conclusion
Pandemic research preparedness requires public engagement, attention to global research justice, adoption of open science and responsive governance. The PREPARED Code of Conduct for Research during Pandemics reflects these insights in practical recommendations.

The Evolving Landscape of Research Integrity in West Africa

Prof. Fred Yao Gbagbo[1], *Mrs. Josephine Akosua Gbagbo*[1]
[1]*University of Education, Winneba, Ghana*

Objectives
This review examined the Research Integrity (RI) Development Landscape in West Africa to inform policy and program decisions for responsible conduct of research in West Africa.

Methods
Data was collected in March 2025, from key stakeholders in research across Ghana and West Africa via email, phone calls, and face-to-face in-depth interviews. Policy and project documents across W/A were also reviewed. The following five key areas of major concerns to enhancing RI in W/A were examined: (1) RI development land scape in W/A, (2) capacity building in RI in W/A, (3) Institutional Networks for RI in W/A, (4) Projects on RI in W/A, (5) Funding for RI in W/A

Results
Remarkable achievements exist in the RI Development Landscape in W/A. Notably, NYU-UG RITP has a collaboration between NYU Grossman School of Medicine and the University of Ghana School of Public Health to enhance research ethics, integrity, and governance in Ghana and West Africa. The ongoing Capacity Building initiatives on Research Integrity in W/A are yielding desired results. For instance, the NYU-UG RITP Fellowship programme (2018-2023), trained 30 researchers in three-year cohorts and is now training 24 researchers in two cohorts, including fellows from Liberia and Sierra Leone. NYU-UG RITP in 2022 also established Master's Programmes in Research Integrity. Five fellowship program graduates completed master's degrees in bioethics at NYU Centre for Bioethics, while NYU-UG RITP established an MSc bioethics program at UG-SPH for West African RI initiatives' sustainability. There has also been an improvement in Institutional Networks for Research Integrity in W/A. Notably among them include: Ghanaian Research Ethics Network (GREN), Gambia Research Ethics and Methodology Training Initiative (GamREMTI), Africa Research Integrity Network (ARIN), and African Bioethics Network (ABN). The Fogarty International Centre has been the main funder of Research Integrity Projects in W/A.

Conclusion and Recommendations
The lack of national ethics guidelines, institutional weaknesses, and low funding in West African countries hinder RI. Advocacy for national and institutional commitments to implement the Hong Kong Principles, Cape Town Declaration, and Athens Statement can improve ethical and responsible research conduct in West Africa.

5.F - Oral Session

May 5, 2026, 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM

Exploring Diversity in Clarivate's Highly Cited Researchers List: A Cross-Sectional Study

Dr. Andrea Tricco[1,2], *Ms. Daniella Rangira*[1], *Ms. Hafsa Ishaque*[1], *Dr. Pavel Zhelnov*[1,3], *Dr. Sharon Straus*[1,3,4], *Dr. Ebrahim Bagheri*[5], *Dr. Gowri Gopalakrishna*[6], *Dr. David Tovey*[7], *Prof. David Moher*[8], *Dr. Lesley Uttley*[9], *Dr. Nancy Baxter*[10]

[1]*Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [2]*Epidemiology Division & Institute of Health Policy, Management, & Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [3]*Institute for Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [4]*Department of Medicine, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [5]*Faculty of Information, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [6]*Department of Epidemiology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands,* [7]*Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, Sussex, United Kingdom,* [8]*Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada,* [9]*School of Medicine and Population Health, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom,* [10]*Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

Objective
Clarivate's Highly Cited Researchers (HCR) list is a benchmark of research excellence, yet evidence shows it overrepresents men and researchers from high-income, English-speaking regions. Overlooking these inequities limits scientific progress by undervaluing contributions from key groups and communities. Analyses to date have focused narrowly on select demographics, with less attention to broader representation or collaboration practices. This study addresses these gaps in two phases: Phase 1 will assess diversity and representation within the HCR list; Phase 2 will examine collaboration networks, focusing on trainee involvement, open science, and collaborator characteristics.

Methods
We will conduct a cross-sectional analysis using HCR lists from 2014 to 2024, integrating data from Clarivate, SciSciNet, and supplementary sources. Data will be extracted through manual and automated methods, including artificial intelligence. Sampling will be limited to allow manual verification of profiles. In Phase 1, descriptive statistics, cross-tabulations, and comparative analyses will summarize researcher characteristics and representation levels. Phase 2 will use social network analysis, including a cross-sectional analysis of published articles, to determine social capital. Based on the PROGRESS-Plus framework (https://methods.cochrane.org/equity/projects/evidence-equity/progress-plus), our chosen variables are place of residence, language, gender, age, education, socioeconomic status, academic position, institutional affiliations, publication impact, and social capital (focus of Phase 2). Descriptive statistics will summarize characteristic results. Cross-tabulations and comparative analyses will identify over- and under-represented groups or institutions. The study protocol has been registered in Open Science Framework (https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/J9DM4).

Results
The study is ongoing and Phase 1 results will be available at the time of the conference, including data extraction from our sample of 150-450 individuals (~1% of the HCR dataset). Using our sampling procedure, we will extract as much data as possible within the study timeframe. Phase 1 will generate a structured database with descriptive summary statistics and high-level synthesis to inform Phase 2. Progress and preliminary findings based on the proposed analysis in our protocol will be discussed.

Conclusion
Disparities in the HCR list raise equity concerns, however, literature remains limited. This study will empirically examine the diversity in global research recognition and highlight methodological considerations for future equity-focused analyses.

The Structure-Behavior-Action Framework Fosters Research Integrity for the Scientific Community

Daniel Kristanto, Adam Craig, ***Dr. Carl Taswell***[1]
[1]*Brain Health Alliance, Ladera Ranch, USA*

Scientists devoted to truth and integrity work to solve practical problems and gain new insights into the universe, but forces both external and internal to the scientific community divert resources away from these endeavors toward grifting and politicking. Anti-science and authoritarian politicians hinder scholarly collaboration. Academic institutions and funding agencies ignore or suppress allegations of misconduct, allowing dishonest researchers and citation cartels to profit from fraud.

To understand these problems and potential solutions, we examine the scientific enterprise through the Structure-Behavior-Action (SBA) framework, a paradigm often applied to complex systems in engineering and biology. According to SBA, a system's structure constrains its behavior, which in turn advances or hinders its progress. We first identify flaws in two levels of structure: The technology through which scientists share knowledge and the incentives that influence their conduct. Scientists scatter results of their studies across numerous journals, often locking them behind paywalls, which discourages learning the published literature of a field and reviewing past attempts to answer related research questions. The publish-or-perish culture of academia rewards hasty conclusions, self-promotion, and dismissive reviews instead of rigorous work and careful reviews. These shortcomings in both software and social engineering have fragmented the scientific community and obfuscated history, keeping researchers 'rediscovering' the same low-hanging fruit instead of pursuing new challenges.

To ameliorate these problems, we advocate alternative approaches to both knowledge engineering and evaluation of research. To help scholars escape from information silos, we are developing the Nexus-PORTAL-DOORS-Scribe Cyberinfrastructure, which empowers individuals and organizations to create community knowledge spaces that facilitate finding and comparing diverse but related resources. To better distinguish the illusion of novelty from genuine innovation, we are developing the FAIR Metrics for Fair Attribution of Indexed Reports and Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records. These structural improvements will need support from the public, government agencies, universities, nonprofit organizations, and researchers to gain traction and foster the integrity needed for mutualistic collaboration, the courage to aim for lofty goals, and the wisdom to stand on the shoulders of giants to reach them.

Building the Culture of Integrity for Reporting the Use of GenAI Tools in Research – Initiating Sharing Best Practices and a Dialogue on Transparency

Dr. Anu Tammeleht[1,2], *Dr. Erika Löfström*[1]
[1]*University Of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland,* [2]*University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia*

The use of GenAI tools in research is our new reality – GenAI is extensively being used in all areas of life, including research (https://hai.stanford.edu/ai-index/2025-ai-index-report). Researchers are mostly familiar with the requirement that the use of GenAI must be reported. Still, there are differences in how this reporting takes place – occasionally, there is a note that GenAI has been used, sometimes the name of the tool is given, not very often the specific tasks done with the tools are outlined, and even rarer is a report or script with a discussion thread with the GenAI tool.
The goal of the presentation is to initiate a discussion on how GenAI reporting is currently done and how it could be done. We want to examine examples of how GenAI has been reported, how we have done it as part of our own publications and as part of the research we are currently doing. The focus of the presentation is on how to report the use of GenAI to display transparency and contribute to the culture of integrity by doing so.

We believe that GenAI tools used could be listed and accompanied with a description of prompts used and tasks done with them – this provides reviewers and readers an opportunity to see and evaluate the suitability of the tool as well as the researchers' own contribution. GenAI is already in use for quantitative data analysis, in qualitative data analysis, there are still limitations of what GenAI can do. Still, we can see the increase in use of GenAI in qualitative data analysis as well – what are the challenges, e.g., agreeableness of GenAI and the rapid development of these tools, how to overcome them, and how to report their use are important topics to discuss with fellow researchers. The research community must be in charge of this discussion to maintain and build even stronger cultures of integrity. We would like to share insights of our own use of GenAI in qualitative data analysis, some published and some under progress, and propose ways to report it.

Outcome Switching in Cohort Studies of Interventions: Comparison of Registry Records and Published Articles

Dr. Zexing Song[1,2], *Dr. Cecilie Jespersen*[3], *Dr. Asbjørn Hróbjartsson*[3], *Dr. S. Joseph Kim*[1,4], *Dr. Rob Fowler*[1,4], *Dr. Peter C. Austin*[1,5], *Dr. An-Wen Chan*[1,2,4]

[1]*Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [2]*Women's College Research Institute, Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Canada,* [3]*Cochrane Denmark & Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine Odense (CEBMO), University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark,* [4]*Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [5]*ICES, Toronto, Canada*

Objective

To study the prevalence and characteristics of outcome switching, the completeness of outcome pre-specification, and factors associated with outcome switching in cohort studies of interventions.

Methods

This meta-epidemiological study involved longitudinal analyses of cohort studies investigating the causal effects of interventions. Eligible studies were registered on ClinicalTrials.gov within one month of their start date (2014 to 2016) and had published results by 2024. Complete outcome prespecification required explicit definition in the registry of the measurement variable, analysis metric, method of aggregation (the statistic to summarize the outcome within each group), and time point of the primary outcome. We evaluated outcome switching by identifying discrepancies in the primary outcomes between the registry and published articles, including omission (prespecified primary outcomes not reported), downgrading (prespecified primary outcomes reported as nonprimary), upgrading (prespecified nonprimary outcomes reported as primary), and introduction of new primary outcomes not listed in the registry.

Results

Of 9965 registration records screened, 124 eligible studies with results published between 2015 and 2024 were included. Only 30 studies (24%) completely prespecified their primary outcomes, with the method of aggregation being the least commonly defined element (N=35, 28%). Outcome switching was found in 60 (48%) studies, but only two provided an explanation. The most common types were omission (N=32, 26%) and downgrading (N=32, 26%), followed by introduction of new primary outcomes (N=25, 20%), and upgrading (N=2, 2%). Three studies involving only omission were excluded from further analysis due to unknown results of the omitted outcomes. Among the remaining 57 studies, statistically significant results were favored in 77% (44/57) by introducing/upgrading a new significant primary outcome or downgrading a nonsignificant one. None of the study characteristics evaluated were significantly associated with outcome switching in multivariable logistic regression.

Conclusion

Outcome switching and inadequate outcome pre-specification are common in cohort studies of interventions. Most outcome changes were unexplained and favored statistically significant results, raising concerns about selective reporting and highlighting the need for improved transparency.

Ten Years of Developments in National Research Integrity Systems across Europe

Mr. Bert Seghers[1,2,5], *Prof. Ana Marušić*[3,5,1], *Dr. Panagiotis Kavouras*[4,1], *Dr. Marie-Madeleine Trottmann*[1]
[1]European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Belgium, [2]Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Brussels, Belgium, [3]University of Split, School of Medicine, Split, Croatia, [4]HEAL-link, Library & Information Centre, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece, [5]the Embassy of Good Science, the Netherlands

What do national research integrity landscapes in Europe look like in 2026 — and how did we get there?

How countries and their institutions safeguard research integrity (RI) and handle allegations, varies across Europe. While many European countries rely on self-regulation — where institutions handle allegations internally — national-level bodies often play complementary roles. These include acting as second-opinion or advisory bodies, assessing FFP (fabrication, falsification, plagiarism) cases, overseeing institutional practices, coordinating national RI communities, and maintaining long-term policy attention for RI.

In this work, we share how the European landscape of RI monitoring has evolved over the last decade. Many national-level organisations have been established. New national laws, policies, codes and charters have determined how the RI landscape looks today. In some countries, national bodies are under development at the time of writing this abstract and might have been launched by May 2026.

Rather than a formal research study, this work draws on the authors' extensive experience in understanding how national RI landscapes mature. We give an overview of developments and share our insights and lessons learned during the last 10 years. The presented developments are sourced from:
(1) First-hand testimonies of members of ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices we are all part of; and
(2) Country Reports: information cards describing national RI structures, laws, capacities, processes and organisations.
The concept of Country reports was suggested at the World Conference for Research Integrity in Rio de Janeiro in 2015 [1], and later developed (in parallel) and hosted by ENRIO [2] and the Embassy of Good Science [3], two collaborating organisations we chair.

REFERENCES
[1] Kleinert S., Marušić A., Focus track on improving research systems: the role of countries. In: O'Brien, S.P., Chan, D., Leung, F. et al. Proceedings of the 4th World Conference on Research Integrity. Res Integr Peer Rev 1 (Suppl 1), 9 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-016-0012-9
[2] ENRIO Country Reports, https://www.enrio.eu/country-reports/
[3] The Embassy of Good Science Country Report Cards, https://embassy.science/wiki/Special:BrowseData/Report

Public Reporting of Research Integrity Breaches and Misconduct in Germany

Dr. Viktor Scholz[1]
[1]*Ombudsgremium für die wissenschaftliche Integrität in Deutschland, Berlin, Germany*

Given the confidentiality of the work in research integrity consultation, mediation, and investigation in most European countries such as Germany, institutions dealing with integrity violations and misconduct can usually not publish information on their enquiries and cases without compromising the identity of the parties involved. As a consequence, data on research integrity is hard to come by. For meta-researchers, this results in a lack of empirical data; for the management of HEIs and research institutions, it can become difficult to promote research integrity in a constructive and targeted fashion based on more than voluntary surveys; and for the general public, research quality remains a black box apart from the few, but spotlighted cases of misconduct that are reported in the media or publicly sanctioned by institutions.
There are, however, publicly available records that disclose information on integrity breaches and misconduct to different degrees. At least in Europe, two general approaches to reporting are distinguishable: (i) Publishing (anonymized to different degrees) reports of specific cases in databanks, e.g. in Austria, Denmark or the Netherlands, and (ii) publishing research integrity reports that contain aggregated data on cases and enquiries, e.g. in Germany or the United Kingdom. Both approaches can be pursued on the national level, on the level of single institutions, or both.
In Germany, the second approach is common, with the peculiarity that reporting on enquiries or cases is voluntary and happens on both the national and institutional level. As of 2025, three university ombuds offices and one ombuds office for doctoral researchers have chosen to publish annual research integrity reports, while cases and inquiries on the national level are documented in the annual reports of the Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany, dating back to 2000.
The presentation will give an overview of the practice of research integrity reporting in the German research area, its underlying logic, and its implications for research management and integrity promotion, as well as attempt an outlook on future developments in the area of integrity reporting.

Understanding Peer Review Practices in Japan: A Discipline-Based Analysis of a Nationwide Survey

Dr. Masaki Nakamura[1], *Ms. Xinyu Zhao*[1], *Jin Higashijima*[2]
[1]*The University of Osaka, Suita, Japan,* [2]*Chiba University, Chiba, Japan*

Objective
In recent years, concerns about peer review misconduct and discussions on how to improve the peer review system are actively underway. Against this background, this study aims to explore how Japanese researchers perceive and experience peer review in practice. Specifically, we examine what challenges Japanese researchers recognize, what problems they have encountered, and what they consider desirable peer review system. The study also seeks to clarify both the shared view across the disciplines and the differences that characterize distinct academic disciplines.

Method
The survey was distributed online in May 2023 to all 2,200 members and associate members of the Science Council of Japan, the Japanese national academy, yielding 531 valid responses. It addressed three roles—author, reviewer, and editor—and covered experiences, perceptions, and expectations regarding peer review and its challenges. The aggregated results have been made publicly available on the Council's official website. In this study, in addition to referring to these aggregated results, we conducted supplementary analyses focusing on disciplinary differences and commonalities by compiling discipline-specific data. The analysis focused on multiple-response and pairwise comparisons across these categories to examine both shared perception and discipline-specific characteristics.

Results
Across all disciplines, respondents regarded peer review as indispensable for maintaining research quality. However, the emphasis differed by discipline. In biology and agricultural sciences, respondents focused on evaluating whether research results and their interpretations were valid. By contrast, researchers in chemistry, engineering, and interdisciplinary fields placed greater emphasis on assessing the originality of the work. Differences also emerged in both practiced and preferred review methods. The use and perceived appropriateness of single-blind, double-blind, triple-blind, and open peer review systems varied across disciplines, reflecting the distinct publication cultures.

Conclusion
Peer review practices in Japan demonstrate both disciplinary diversity and shared systemic challenges. The findings contribute to understanding how Japan's scholarly communities perceive research integrity through peer review, offering empirical evidence to inform policy discussions on the peer review system. As the survey targeted members and associate members of the Science Council of Japan, it mainly reflects the views of established researchers, which should be recognized as a limitation of this study.

A Matched Pairs Analysis of Registered Reports vs. Traditional Papers: Publication Timelines, Submissions, and Peer Review Experiences

*Dr. Tristan Tibbe[1], **Dr. Amanda Montoya**[1], Dr. William Krenzer[2]*
[1]University Of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA, [2]Duke University, Durham, USA

Objective
Registered Reports, in which manuscripts undergo peer review before data collection and analysis, with publication decisions made prior to knowing the results, have been in place for over a decade. They have become an established part of the publication process, expanding from a handful of psychology and neuroscience journals to hundreds across diverse research fields. Despite this growth, researcher adoption has been slow, with concerns about extended publication timelines due to multiple peer-review stages.

Methods
This study, accepted in principle as a Registered Report, examines 100 matched pairs of Registered Reports and traditional papers published in the same journals at the same time. To better understand these publishing models, we surveyed authors on peer-review timelines, number of submissions to other journals, and revision rounds.

Results
We provide concrete evidence on whether and how Registered Reports compare to traditional papers in terms of publishing efficiency, including months under peer review, number of revisions, and number of journals submitted to. Additionally, we compare the ratings of the quality of peer review between traditional and registered report papers.

Conclusion
It is widely expected by the research community that registered reports take longer to publish, but these differences may be overcome by the number of journals submitted to and the quality of peer review. By providing empirical insights, this study aims to inform journal policies and researcher decision-making, ultimately fostering broader engagement with this publishing model.

The Influence of Gender in Peer Review in the Health Sciences

Dr. Gráinne McNamara[1], *Ms. Stephanie Sadler*[1], *Dr. Teresa Telles Gonçalves Mathews*[1]
[1]*Karger Publishers, Basel, Switzerland*

Objective
Publication integrity may be undermined by biases which can negatively impact the journal editorial boards and the peer review process. One aspect of bias is gender imbalance or a lack of diversity in gender. We aim to understand how gender can influence behaviours and outcomes in the peer review process and whether this varies between subdisciplines within health sciences. We will present an analysis of the role of gender in the peer review process at Karger Publishers, across health sciences disciplines from 2020-2025 during which time there were ongoing initiatives to promote greater gender diversity in journal editorial boards.

Methods
We will use Karger Publishers' database of author, reviewer and editor demographic data, as well as peer review process and decision information for over 90 journals. Gender will be estimated based on an individuals' first name and the country of affiliation using GenderAPI software. Gender estimate accuracy of 60-79 or 80-100 will be reported as moderate accuracy or high accuracy, respectively. Accuracy below 60 will be reported as unknown.

Results
We will present summary data on author, reviewer and editor gender, as well as the global variation in number and demographics and whether this has changed over time. We will present data on the interplay between editor, reviewer, corresponding author gender, proportion of female authors, and peer review decisions.

Conclusion
This work will examine how gender can influence peer review within the health sciences and whether publisher initiatives to diversify journal editorial boards affected the interplay within the peer review process. A limitation of the work is that the gender analysis is based on estimates rather than self-reported gender identity. Therefore, it does not account for the influence of self-identified gender or non-binary gender identities on peer review and can not disambiguate gender for gender neutral names. Additionally, the reference database is larger, and therefore potentially more accurate, for countries in the global north. Overall, this study will present a high-level overview of trends in gender representation in the subdisciplines of health sciences and allow for comparison with other similar published work in other disciplines.

Research Practices and Transparency in Slovak Social Sciences: A National Analysis Based on Random Sampling of Publications (2013-2022)

Dr. Marcel Martončik[1,2], *Dr. Matus Adamkovic*[1,2,3], *Peter Babinčák*[4], *Gabriel Baník*[1,5], *Jaroslava Bočanová*[4], *Denisa Fedáková*[1], *Richard Gamrát*[5], *Samar Issmailová*[1], *Klára Kačmariková*[4], *Pavol Kačmár*[5], *Michal Kentoš*[1], *Adam Pekarčík*[5], *Benjamin Šimsa*[1,5], *Lenka Vargová*[1,6], *Ivan Ropovik*[1,3,6]

[1]*Institute of Social Sciences CSPS SAS, Košice, Slovakia,* [2]*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland,* [3]*Faculty of Education, Charles University, Czech Republic,* [4]*Faculty of Arts, University of Presov, Prešov, Slovakia,* [5]*Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University, Košice, Slovakia,* [6]*Faculty of Education, University of Presov, Prešov, Slovakia*

Objective

Transparent research practices constitute a fundamental prerequisite for replicable and trustworthy scientific knowledge. Given that large-scale projects consistently demonstrate challenges in reproducibility, replicability, and research practices, skepticism persists in domestic environments about whether these issues affect local research outputs. This contribution aims to present findings from an analysis of the prevalence of responsible and problematic research practices in the Slovak academic context. The main objectives are to (1) provide descriptive characteristics of published research with a focus on their methodology and statistics, (2) conduct an analysis of responsible research practices, examine statistical inconsistencies using the GRIM technique, and assess the prevalence of these practices.

Methods

Through random sampling, 1,000 articles published in peer-reviewed journals with Slovak institutional affiliations were selected from the total population of scientific outputs by social science researchers (i.e., sociology, psychology, economics, political science, anthropology, education, humanities, law, international relations, management, and communication) during the reporting period 2013-2022.

Results

The report covers the proportion of empirical studies versus other research types, the distribution of various research designs, and the prevalence of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. For empirical studies, the findings focus on various characteristics including sample size justification and compuation, sampling procedure descriptions, reliability and statistical methods reporting, missing data handling, effect size reporting, categorical or exact p-value presentation, ethical statements, conflict of interest declarations, data sharing policies, code availability, preregistration practices, and actual accessibility of declared materials. Additionally, temporal comparisons will be presented to assess whether progress in research practices and transparency has occurred over time.

Conclusion

The findings suggest a notable absence of responsible research practices and offer the first comprehensive analysis based on a random national sample of publications from this region. This provides crucial baseline evidence that contributes to the global understanding of research quality standards and can inform targeted interventions in research training curricula and science policy development worldwide.

A Geopolitical Perspective on the Approach to Research Integrity, Human Agency, and Oversight for Generative AI in Research

*Prof Sonia Vasconcelos[1], Daiana da Silva Aragão[1], Dr. Karina de Albuquerque Rocha[1], Jesús Mena-Chalco[2], Elizabeth Heitman[3], **Prof. Ana Marušić**[4]*

[1]University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia, [2]Institute of Medical Biochemistry Leopoldo de Meis – Science Education Program– Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, [3]Center of Mathematics, Computation and Cognition (CMCC), Universidade Federal do ABC (UFABC), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, [4]Department of Psychiatry's Division of Ethics and the Program in Ethics in Science and Medicine, University of Texas Southwestern, Dallas, USA

Objective

Understanding the role and influence of research integrity in the current global Generative AI (Gen AI) race is a key concern for researchers and scholars in research integrity, science policy, and education. Our goal in this presentation is to offer a projection of how explicit concerns over and policies to reinforce human agency and ethical oversight for Gen AI in research are gradually transforming the geopolitics of research integrity and leadership in this field.

Methods

We have drawn upon publications and reports from the 2022-2025 period, a flourishing period for Gen AI, collected via a detailed search on Google Scholar. We compiled a dataset of records, with the PDF files available, for text mining and an ongoing thematic analysis of code occurrences in the main corpus, using Atlas.ti with an integrated Generative AI tool from OpenAI.

Results

As our flowchart will show, the 1,140 works from Google Scholar yielded a qualitative analysis of themes and trends, offering an overview of the current relationship among Gen AI, governance, ethics, research integrity, human agency, and oversight mechanisms. Our preliminary analysis shows that the largest share of documents linking Gen AI advances to concerns about research integrity/ethics comes from non-US sources.

Conclusion

When it comes to ethics regulation of Gen AI in research, including the role of human agency and oversight in conceiving responsible Human-Gen AI collaboration, the results of this study will demonstrate how explicit concerns over and policies to strengthen human agency and ethical oversight for Gen AI in research seem to be gradually changing the geopolitics of research integrity. We will show how themes, patterns, and concepts can shed light on a new paradigm for the ethical regulation of research permeated with Gen AI in all fields and suggest implications for the research integrity landscape.

The Stockholm Declaration for a Reformation of Science Publishing

Prof. Bernhard Sabel[1], *Prof Dan Larhammar*[2]
[1]*Otto-v.-Guericke University of Magdeburg, Berlin, Deutschland,* [2]*University of Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden*

Integrity of academic publishing, a cornerstone of science, is critical for the advancement of health care, technological development and economic growth. Yet, the publishing system is targeted by three major threats: for-profit publishers create barriers to research dissemination and demand substantial fees for open access which generates 30-40% profits from academia. Especially predatory journals publish a flood of low-quality papers without adequate peer review and “paper mills” massively pollute the scientific literature with fake articles and fake data.
Although numerous codes of conduct for research integrity and academic publishing have been disseminated to ascertain high research quality and integrity, the number of low-quality and fraudulent publications have dramatically increased. This upsurge is driven by a “reputation economy” where quantitative metrics (publication number, impact factors, h-Index) often count more than the quality of the research. These metrics are gamed, among others, by hundreds of thousands of fake publications each year from a corrupt “paper mill” industry that sells authorships to scientists under pressure to publish and bribes editors to accept these papers. This development is accelerated by AI and is very concerning. This drains not only financial resources provided by taxpayers and funders, but it also distorts studies, wastes efforts to perform studies that build upon them, leads to meaningless replication studies, false information which is later hard to debunk, and undermines practical applications, e.g. in medical care and engineering. It is arguably the largest science crisis of all time threatening to erode people's trust in research.
The Stockholm Declaration -drafted at a meeting at the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences- is a “call-to-action” for all stakeholders around the world to unite in reforming the science publishing culture and to assure academic freedom and trustworthiness by community control. A set of principles was defined to accomplish good publishing practice to be implemented worldwide. We urge learned societies, funding agencies, policy makers, publishers, and those who translate scientific progress into practical applications to act. Trust in science is critical for informed, balanced and reliable decision-making and to preserve our global knowledge base, i.e. the scientific record, and the integrity of science itself.

Use of Confucian Virtues as a Coherent Scheme in Research Ethics Education

Prof. Tetsuji Iseda[1]
[1]*Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan*

Present-day researchers face multiplicity of responsibilities. Traditional responsibilities of protecting human research subjects and research integrity are getting more and more extensive, detailed and complicated. In addition, researchers are now regarded as responsible for many other issues, including care for experimental animals, considerations of dual use and national security, appropriate use of research funding, awareness for social justice, respect for diversity of research subjects and fellow researchers, among others. Those responsibilities are now incorporated in regulations and guidelines as concrete rules and procedures, and researchers have to learn those rules and procedures.
A worry that arises with this situation is that prospective researchers may lose sight of what kind of person a researcher is expected to be. If research ethics classes spend too much time on learning detailed rules procedures required for research ethics and integrity, students may get the wrong message that a good researcher is a person who memorizes all those detailed rules and procedures. This is a failure as an ethics education.
What is required here is a presentation of simple, coherent image of a responsible researcher that prospective researchers can keep in mind to make sense of flood of detailed information on ethics and integrity. There are various ways to present such an image, and the one proposed here is one based on Confucian virtues.
Confucian virtues are widely known among East Asian countries, and has been used to present a coherent picture of desirable person. Five key virtues are ren (仁, benevolence), yi (義, rightness), li (禮, propriety), zhi (智, wisdom) and xin（信, sincerity). Even though we have to reconsider concrete contents of those virtues so that these virtues fit the contemporary world, a coherent model of person who obey these five virtues still seem to make sense in the contemporary world. One advantage of using those five virtues is that some of them seem to be connected to research ethics and integrity items naturally. With those helps, prospective researchers will find understanding responsible researcher easier than just learning detailed rules and procedures.

Bridging Classrooms and Cultures: A Contextual Approach To Research Ethics in Indian Medical Training

Dr. Barna Ganguly[1]
[1]*P. S. Medical College, Bhaikaka University, Gujarat, India, Anand, India,* [2]*Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal*

The inclusion of Bioethics within the Attitude, Ethics and Communication (AETCOM) module under the Competency-Based Medical Education (CBME) curriculum introduced by the National Medical Commission (NMC) in 2020 marked a transformative step in Indian medical training. However, the translation of these competencies from policy to practice remains uneven across institutions, largely due to contextual, cultural, and infrastructural diversity.

This study explored the need for a contextualized approach to research ethics pedagogy, drawing from faculty experiences and students' feedback across varied medical settings in India. The analysis reveals that while AETCOM provides a structured framework for ethical learning, its implementation often lacks alignment with local realities—such as regional languages, sociocultural values, and differing levels of faculty preparedness particularly in research ethics and practices.

Through qualitative observations and feedback-based insights, the study proposes pedagogical strategies that bridge classroom learning and community-based experiences. These include scenario-based teaching drawn from local clinical and research contexts, use of vernacular case narratives and facilitated small-group discussions using the Socratic method. Such approaches can help students internalize ethical principles not merely as theoretical constructs but as tools for navigating real-world dilemmas in patient care and research.

The presentation argues that embedding context into AETCOM implementation enhances ethical sensitivity, cultural competence, and professional identity formation. By acknowledging diversity and fostering reflection, Indian medical education can evolve into a more ethically responsive and culturally rooted framework. Ultimately, this contextual approach not only strengthens research integrity but also nurtures a generation of physicians capable of ethical decision-making within India's pluralistic healthcare landscape.

Development and Implementation of Hybrid Multidisciplinary Graduate Training in Responsible Conduct of Research

Prof. Clement Adebamowo[1,2], *Prof. Christopher Agulanna*[2,3], *Mr Adesola Adeyemo*[2], *Prof. Temidayo Ogundiran*[2,3], *Prof. Adebayo Adejumo*[2,3], *Mr Olusegun Adeyemo*[2], *Prof. Sally Adebamowo*[1]
[1]*University Of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, USA,* [2]*Center for Bioethics and Research, Ibadan, Nigeria,* [3]*University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria*

Objective
There is growing appreciation of the need for training in Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) globally. In addition to short courses and mentoring for researchers, longer duration training is required for institutional and academic leaders in RCR. There are few well designed, contextually relevant training programs for this cadre of resource people in different parts of the world.

Methods
We built on decades of training and research experience in bioethics to design and implement multi-disciplinary graduate-level curriculum for RCR suitable for institutional research integrity officers (RIO) and researchers in RCR in Nigeria. We present the outcome of the implementation of the curriculum since its initiation in 2022. We highlight its novel components and the trainees' research which is focused on building evidence for the status of various components of RCR in the country.

Results
Twenty-five trainees have completed didactic coursework and are now in various stages of project implementation. The RCR curriculum included materials on egoism, nihilism, free-will, moral reasoning and virtue ethics in philosophy, safe and sexual harassment free environment, diversity in the workplace, conflicts of interests, mediation, conflict resolution, laws on sexual harassment, liability, etc., and culture, all based on global principles applied to local contexts. Trainees research projects include development of locally relevant case studies, local laws and regulations, institutional policies, knowledge, attitudes, and practices of research misconduct, diversity, conflicts of interest, and sexual harassment. Trainees' evaluation of the training would also be presented.

Conclusion
There is urgent need to build capacity for training and research in contextually relevant RCR for different parts of the world. Our curriculum highlights the blending of global and locally relevant topics to equip RIOs with the ability to train, conduct research, and provide institutional leadership and service in RCR.

Examining the Effect of Value-Based and Consequence-Based Interventions on Questionable Research Practices: An Experimental Study

Prof. Kalypso Iordanou[1], *Prof. Andero Uusberg*[2], *Dr. Daniele Fanelli*[3], *Alan Voodla*[2]
[1]*Uclan Cyprus, Larnaca, Cyprus,* [2]*University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia,* [3]*Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK*

Objective
This study investigated whether activating internal integrity values or highlighting adverse external consequences could reduce questionable research practices. We hypothesized that increasing psychological activation of motives related to personal values or negative consequences would increase endorsement of high integrity behaviors when researchers face ethical dilemmas.

Methods
Following pre-registration (Iordanou et al., 2025), we conducted a between-subjects online experiment (n=634) with PhD-level participants from Prolific Academic randomly assigned to three conditions: values, consequences, or control. Participants completed three writing tasks to activate condition-relevant motives, then evaluated courses of action across ten research integrity dilemma vignettes from the Erasmus University Rotterdam's Dilemma Game.

Results
Both interventions showed immediate effects on the first vignette following the manipulation. Repeated measures ANOVAs revealed significant condition effects ($F(6, 1893)=9.35$, $p<.001$). Low integrity options were rated significantly lower in both consequences ($b=-0.97$, $p<.001$) and values ($b=-0.63$, $p=.008$) conditions versus control. High integrity options were rated higher in consequences ($b=0.65$, $p=.003$) and values ($b=0.48$, $p=.037$) conditions. The consequences condition significantly increased selection of integrity-preserving options compared to control, but only in the first vignette. Effects did not generalize to subsequent vignettes without explicit prompting.
Individual differences revealed complex moderating patterns. Experience level interacted significantly with conditions, showing consequence interventions had strongest impact on early- and mid-career researchers, suggesting career-stage-tailored training approaches. Field of work produced significant three-way interactions: Social Sciences participants showed heightened sensitivity to framing effects, rating integrity-rejecting responses higher in both experimental conditions versus control. Publication history moderated relationships, with researchers having 8+ publications demonstrating more nuanced differentiation across options. Academic position influenced integrity evaluations independent of experimental conditions. Regardless of condition, high integrity options were more frequently selected by participants with 10+ years experience, 8+ publications, and faculty/postdoctoral positions. Self-reported research proficiency did not predict integrity-congruent choices.

Conclusion
Value-based and consequence-based interventions effectively promoted research integrity, but only when motives remained psychologically salient. Results underscore the critical importance of sustained engagement with values or consequences throughout research. Strategies such as ongoing training, mentorship, visual reminders, and transparent institutional practices may help maintain psychological accessibility of integrity-promoting values.

Registration of Research on Research Integrity is still Not Common: Findings from the Hong Kong, Cape Town, and Athens Editions of the World Conference on Research Integrity

Prof Lex Bouter[1], *Dr Wilco Emons*[2], *Klaas Sijtsma*[2]
[1]*Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam Universities Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands,* [2]*Department of Methodology and Statistics, Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands*

Objective
Assessing the prevalence and characteristics of registration of empirical studies presented at three editions of the World Conference on Research Integrity (Hong Kong, 2019; Cape Town, 2022; Athens, 2024) at the time of abstract submission.

Method
During registration and abstract submission, applicants were invited to answer questions on registration of the study they present and their academic background. Study protocol is registered at: https://osf.io/2f3be/

Results
Descriptive analyses of the responses regarding a total of 452 abstracts describing empirical studies, showed that the prevalence of registration among presenters of empirical research did not increase across the three WCRIs, and were on average 28 percent. The verifiability of claims of registration did increase over time, however, and went from 44 to 88 percent of the abstracts of empirical studies claimed to be registered. Reasons given for not registering varied substantially, but little faith in its usefulness and unfamiliarity were frequently mentioned. Younger researchers tended to register more often than others, and researchers with a biomedical background registered more frequently. Preprint available at https://osf.io/preprints/metaarxiv/cn6jf

Conclusion
We suggest to simplify the registration process and propose that funding agencies, research institutes and scholarly journals should demand registration of empirical studies.

6.C - Oral Session

10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Retraction Discussions on Bluesky: Public Scrutiny or Misinformation Spreading?

Mr. Er-Te Zheng[1], *Hui-Zhen Fu*[2], *Dr. Xiaorui Jiang*[1], *Dr. Zhichao Fang*[3,4], *Prof. Mike Thelwall*[1]
[1]*University Of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom,* [2]*Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China,* [3]*Renmin University of China, Beijing, China,* [4]*Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands*

Objective
This study aims to investigate how retracted articles are discussed on Bluesky and whether such discussions function as constructive public scrutiny or contribute to misinformation spreading. By comparing sentiment and engagement patterns across pre- and post-retraction articles, retraction notices, and non-retracted articles, we seek to reveal the communicative dynamics of retraction-related discourse.

Methods
We collected Bluesky post referencing scholarly articles for the period between January 2023 and September 2025, including 1,013 posts related to retracted articles (165 before and 848 after retraction), 192 posts about retraction notices, and 1,344,756 posts about non-retracted articles. We analysed post sentiment across these categories to examine whether discussions represent public scrutiny or misinformation spreading.

Results
Discussions of retracted articles and retraction notices were extremely limited on Bluesky, accounting for only about 0.09% of all posts. Posts after retraction were roughly five times more numerous than those before, indicating that retraction events stimulate substantial public attention. Across Bluesky posts discussing articles before and after retraction, as well as retraction notices, negative sentiments (e.g. “this paper was riddled with lies”) predominated (44.2%–52.8%), suggesting that social media can act as a post-publication peer review mechanism enabling public scrutiny of questionable research. A smaller share of posts remained positive after retraction (23.6%) and for retraction notices (17.7%), implying continued circulation or defence of retracted findings that may contribute to misinformation. Among non-retracted articles, 3.8% of posts were negative, potentially signalling problematic papers, though such criticism may also reflect subjective disagreement rather than genuine flaws. Negative posts generally received higher engagement (likes, reposts, replies, and quotes) than positive ones. Posts about retraction notices showed the highest engagement, followed by retracted articles, while non-retracted articles attracted the least. These findings indicate that Bluesky users demonstrate heightened attention and interaction toward discussions of problematic science.

Conclusion
Our findings highlight the dual role of social media in retraction discussion. While Bluesky discussions often promote accountability and post-publication review through critical engagement, a minority of positive posts continue to disseminate retracted content, emphasising the need for improved scientific literacy and responsible information sharing on emerging platforms.

Variations in Drivers, Barriers and Incentives for Reproducibility Across Europe

Dr. Veerle Van den Eynden[1], *Mrs. Magdalena Kozula*[2], *Dr. Nicholas DeVito*[3], *Cinzia Colombo*[4], *Patrick Onghena*[2]
[1]*Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium,* [2]*KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium,* [3]*University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom,* [4]*Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche Mario Negri, Milan, Italy*

Reproducibility of research, with transparency and openness are closely connected to research integrity, contributing to research credibility and trust in science.

Objective
Open Science to Increase Reproducibility in Science (OSIRIS) examines the underlying barriers, drivers and incentives for reproducibility in the European research ecosystem.

Method
We interviewed 60 European researchers about their views, practices and motivations for reproducibility across disciplines, with factors that facilitate or hinder, sampling for diversity across career stage, gender, discipline and geography. Focus group discussions with funders, journals, research institution leadership, reproducibility networks, reproducibiliTea journal clubs and CSOs explored roles and responsibilities of these stakeholders to assure the quality and trustworthiness of research, with initiatives to facilitate or remove barriers.

Results
Barriers for reproducible work stem from the academic ecosystem, research culture, practical constraints, and the way research is done. Policies and guidelines by universities, funders or publishers are key facilitators, alongside infrastructure, training and support staff. Community values, research visibility and the reputation as a good scientist motivates researchers towards reproducible research. Important variations and inconsistencies exist, however, across Europe and its institutions. Funders' open science and data sharing policies as a key driver is flagged stronger amongst researchers in western and northern Europe, compared to southern and eastern. Early career researchers are more likely to receive training that benefits reproducible research compared to senior researchers, with southern European researchers receiving little relevant training. Senior researchers in top funded institutions give more training to ECRs compared to other research institutions. The publish or perish culture is signalled as a more important barrier to reproducibility by male versus female researchers; is weightier as a barrier in top funded institutions compared to others; and is relatively insignificant as a barrier for western European researchers compared to others. Lack of support or time as a barrier is most important in northern Europe compared to other regions. Cost and lack of funding are indicated as a higher barrier in top funded institutions.

Conclusion
A granular understanding of regional, disciplinary and other variations across the European research landscape is key to inform policy and practices for reproducible research.

Mental Health in Academia: Are We Facing a Mental Health Crisis? And How Does It Relate to Research Integrity? Results From a Nationwide Survey on Mental Health and Social Safety in the Netherlands

Dr. Joeri Tijdink[1]
[1]*Amsterdam Umc, Location Vumc, Netherlands,* [2]*De Jonge Akademie, Netherlands*

Objective
Growing evidence highlights the mental health challenges faced by researchers. Beyond individual distress, systemic factors such as research culture, publication pressure, and evaluation practices strongly influence academic wellbeing and research practices. These performance-based metrics shape behavior, often at the cost of mental health, collaboration, and research integrity. This study explores how mental health, safety, and integrity are interrelated in Dutch academia.

Methods
We conducted a nationwide, cross-sectional survey among researchers in the Netherlands, initiated by the Dutch Young Academy. Using validated questionnaires, we assessed depression, anxiety, stress, happiness, job satisfaction, workload, working hours, and psychological safety. More than 2,000 academics across disciplines and career stages participated, providing insight into the mental health in academia.

Results
Preliminary analyses show concerning levels of distress: 25% of respondents report moderate to severe depressive symptoms, and over 20% experience high levels of stress. Mental health problems are associated with feelings of psychological or social unsafety, excessive workload, and long working hours. Publication pressure emerges as a key factor—participants who feel pressured to publish or secure grants report significantly poorer well-being.
Moreover, respondents indicated that low psychological safety relates to research practices, suggesting a link between mental health and research integrity. Early-career researchers and women report higher stress levels and lower perceived safety than their senior or male counterparts. These findings echo international research showing that cultural and systemic pressures, rather than individual resilience alone, drive the mental burden in academia.
Together, the results underscore that mental health problems in academia are not isolated incidents but symptoms highly associated to structural and cultural issues.

Conclusion
Our findings suggest that academia faces a mental health crisis deeply connected to research culture and integrity. The results call for reflection on how we shape academia, how poor mental health could be a symptom of poor research practices, and potentially how we have organized academia where imbalanced evaluation systems, high workloads, hypercompetition, and power dynamics shape researcher wellbeing. We invite discussion on how individual, institutional, and systemic changes can foster a healthier and more responsible research culture.

A Global Snapshot and Living Database of Funder Policies on Open Science

Dr. Dominique Roche[1]
[1]*Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Canada*

Funding agencies across the world increasingly recognize that the current incentive structure in academia is fueling a reproducibility crisis driven in large part by hyper competitiveness. In response, many are adopting open science policies to boost research integrity, transparency, and collaboration among researchers. However, the strength of these policies and the pace at which they are being implemented vary greatly among funders and regions of the world. According to the "golden rule", funders are ideally positioned to improve research practices given their unique role in the research ecosystem: those who have the gold make the rules. Therefore, and to encourage and accelerate the adoption of open science policies, we created a database of funder requirements to publish open access and publicly share data and analytical code for more than 100 philanthropies and national funding agencies from countries of the G7, G20, OECD and beyond. The database was assembled through a hackathon organized during the annual meeting of the Society for Open, Reliable, and Transparent Ecology and Evolutionary biology (www.SORTEE.org) in October 2025. Over 40 participants extracted detailed policy elements including mandates to include a data and code availability statement in published papers; mandates to include grant identifiers in funding acknowledgements; compliance monitoring mechanisms with funder policies; and consequences of non-compliance with these policies, among other elements. The data are currently being analyzed and will provide an unprecedented, granular snapshot of where these funder policies stand in 2025, allowing comparisons of policies across different regions and groups (e.g., G7, G20, OECD). A Shiny app will be produced in January 2026, to dynamically visualize policy elements and inform researchers, research institutions, and policymakers alike. The database is in the process of being validated through independent data collection as well as by funders whose policies it contains. In the long term, custodianship of the database will be transferred to the UNSECO's open science division, ensuring that it remains public and up-to-date, enabling future analyses to monitor changes in the policy landscape as it continues to evolve.

The Impact of Policy Change on Science in the United States: A Qualitative Study of Researcher and Community Perspectives

Dr. Susan Passmore[1]
[1]*University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, USA*

Objective
Recent changes brought about by national and state-level policies in the United States have profound implications for health research. These changes include the termination of research funding, restrictions on research topics, threats against academic freedom, and a shift away from the value of research and science in general. This study examined the experiences and perspectives of researchers and community members involved in research aimed at promoting health equity.

Methods
This study consisted of focus groups and interviews with researchers and community members (n = 25) at a research-intensive university in the United States. Questions inquired about their experiences in the current climate and perspectives on the future of health equity research. A reflexive, thematic analysis of qualitative data was conducted following the guidelines set by Braun and Clarke.

Results
Researchers report that their work has been disrupted due to funding terminations and that training opportunities for health equity topics have diminished, threatening the future of the field. Researchers also report feeling pressure to shift their work away from equity-focused research topics, as well as a threat to their academic freedom. Recent mandates on faculty workload threaten protected research time. All of these trends have taken an emotional and psychological toll. Community members report a decrease in interest in collaboration on the part of researchers and concerns that researchers will abandon work on equity. However, they also see a potential for reinvigorated academic / community collaboration. All participants share a concern that continued pressure will lead to the erosion of recent gains in health equity.

Conclusion
Although we report on an ongoing situation and the experiences of a limited number of researchers and community members, the current threats to health research are having a substantial impact on engaged work. This trend may continue to reshape the work of science and, ultimately, public health, in the United States.

Strengthening Research Security in Cameroon: A Review of Legal and Ethical Compliance Frameworks

Ms. Felicite Naah Tabala[1], *Professor Ateudjieu Jerome*[1], *Professor Zoung-kanyi Bissek Anne-Cecile*[1], *Doctor Njamnshi Wepnyu Yembe*[1]
[1]*Division of Health Operational Research, Ministry of Public Health, Yaounde, Cameroon,* [2]*University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa*

Over the past two decades, Cameroon has hosted numerous health research projects, with both successes and significant challenges. The suspension of the Tenofovir PrEP trial in 2005, involving female sex workers, by the Ministry of Public Health highlighted ethical shortcomings in research oversight, particularly regarding participant protection, informed consent, and institutional review capacity (Mack, 2010; Singh, 2005; Mills et al., 2005). This incident underscored weaknesses in research governance and the urgent need for robust research security frameworks.

Cameroon's current research governance is anchored in the 2022 Health Research Law, which establishes comprehensive provisions for biomedical and health research involving humans. The law emphasises rigorous ethical review, informed consent procedures, data confidentiality, international collaboration oversight, and material transfer agreements, building on earlier ministerial guidelines of 2009 and 2012. These guidelines introduced the requirement of double clearance (ethical and administrative) and mandated prior sponsor-country clearance for international projects. The 2010 Cybersecurity and Cybercriminality law and the 2024 Personal Data Protection law, extend protections to digital data, granting participants rights to access and object to data processing. The law stipulates a 10-year storage period for research data. However, challenges arise regarding long-term use, secondary use, and jurisdictional control of data once transferred abroad, raising concerns over fairness, oversight, and the risk of exploitation (Andanda et al., 2013).

Despite these advances, persistent challenges undermine effective compliance. Reports indicate bureaucratic delays, overlapping regulations, and limited capacity within Research Ethics Committees (RECs), where members often lack adequate training (Ateudjieu et al., 2010). Researchers also face difficulties in aligning local and sponsor requirements, with enforcement mechanisms remaining uneven. An internal audit of the Ministry of Health, division of health operational research revealed that between 2020 and 2023, 30% of projects with ethical clearance failed to secure the required administrative approval, underscoring accountability gaps and fuelling mistrust within the research community.

To strengthen research security, Cameroon must invest in inter-ministerial coordination, capacity building for REC members, and greater advocacy and literacy on ethical and legal requirements. Developing robust compliance systems to ensure timely detection of irregularities, coupled with stronger monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, will enhance health research ethics.

Producing Papers, Fabricating Science: Paper Mills in China

Mr. Gengyan Tang[1]
[1]*University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada*

Objective
This research examines the organizational structures that allow for the continued operation of paper mills in China—businesses that manufacture and sell counterfeit scientific articles. Rather than simply identifying and locating fraudulent papers, it explores in detail how these entities streamline production processes, handle various forms of risk, and endure within an environment characterized by legal and reputational sanctions.

Method
A mixed analysis of the 100 available public documents from China- 59 of which were investigative news reports, and 41 were civil court judgments- was undertaken. In the quantitative content analysis, the thematic distributions and the co-occurrence of the described lexicons were mapped. In the qualitative content analysis, the narrative segments were interpreted and analyzed in relation to the patterns of coordination, the organizational structuring of the labor, and the governance avoidance of the paper mills.

Results
Initial insights suggest that Chinese paper mills function with hybrid organizational structures that integrate informal networks with formal business registrations. Judgments indicate that companies and their clients have contractual relationships that are comprehensive and include structures featuring standard prices, staged payments, and clauses for handling disputes. Investigative reports detail production chains for paper mills that include selecting a topic, fabricating data, and manipulating images. They have “quality control” departments tasked with ensuring that manuscripts conform to the journal’s required format and the English language. Risk mitigation comprises the use of proxy authors, phantom companies, and domain jumping to control legal threats. Since the official crackdown of 2018, it is evident that many have adapted to the environment by outsourcing the operations and shifting the servers offshore. Overall, this evidence suggests that paper mills are not transitory fraud but adaptive, embedded organizational entities that exploit structural weaknesses and academic evaluation systems.

Conclusion
Paper mills flourish through organized deception that adapts to institutional expectations. Comprehending their internal organization reveals how the incentives generated by the marketized system of publication continue to support the fraudulent economies of science. The study's final analysis will identify polices of journals, funders, and regulators to interrupt these systems.

AI-Assisted Integrity Checks: Initial Validation Results From the INSPECT-AI Tool for Retraction and Trial Registration in Randomized Controlled Trials

Dr. Colby Vorland[1], *Goutham Indukuri*[2], *Jack Wilkinson*[3], *Somayajulu Sripada*[2], *Mark Bolland*[4], *Andrew Grey*[4], *Professor Ningsheng Chen*[1], *Pranav Kapoor*[1], *Tyler Morris*[1], *Miriam Brazzelli*[2], *Clare Robertson*[2], *Alison Avenell*[2], *Milan Markovic*[2]

[1]*Indiana University School of Public Health-Bloomington, USA,* [2]*University of Aberdeen, UK,* [3]*University of Manchester, UK,* [4]*University of Auckland, New Zealand*

Objective

The inclusion of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with integrity issues in systematic reviews can misguide clinical practice. The recently developed 21-item INSPECT-SR tool [1] provides a standardized way to manually assess the trustworthiness of trials for inclusion in systematic reviews. However, manual integrity assessment is time-consuming. In collaboration with research integrity experts, computer scientists, and five international evidence synthesis organizations, we aim to co-design and evaluate INSPECT-AI, an AI-assisted tool to semi-automate and scale the integrity assessment of published RCTs.

Methods

To semi-automate INSPECT-SR checks, our software tool screens RCT publications in PDF format by using a large language model (Gemini 2.0 Flash) and custom code to integrate data from external databases, including Retraction Watch and clinical trial registries. Herein, we present the first validation results for components of three initial checks: (i) is there an associated retraction of the trial being screened, (ii) extraction of a trial registration identifier if one exists, (iii) extraction of the first registration version date from the registry, and (iv) extraction of the trial enrollment start date from the paper. Our first validation set consisted of 20 trials with known integrity issues and 20 randomly sampled trials from PubMed. Accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score were calculated for each check.

Results

The tool demonstrated perfect accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 Score (all = 1.0) in identifying studies with associated retractions in Retraction Watch's database, as well as trial registration identifiers and the first registration version dates. Extracting the first participant enrollment date from the body of the paper yielded lower scores: accuracy 0.85, precision 0.83, recall 0.92, and F1 0.87. The total cost to process all 40 trials was $.04 USD.

Conclusion

Our initial findings demonstrate that an AI-assisted tool has the potential to efficiently semi-automate research integrity checks for RCTs. This approach can substantially reduce manual effort in evidence synthesis, enhancing the trustworthiness of clinical guidelines. Further development will focus on additional INSPECT-SR checks, and refining the user interface for human-in-the-loop verification.

1. https://osf.io/b74wj/files/osfstorage

From Hypothesis to Evidence: A Systematic Review of Research Misconduct Determinants and a Critical Typology of the Methods Employed to find them

Mr. Baptiste Vendé[2]
[1]*Sorbonne université, Paris, France,* [2]*Office français de l'intégrité scientifique, Paris, France*

This study addresses the lack of consensus on the causal determinants of research misconduct. Although factors such as the "publish or perish" pressure are frequently cited as major causes, recent analyses suggest that these assertions do not rest on empirical foundations. Building on the call for more rigorous investigation into research integrity factors, this work aims to systematically identify determinants of misconduct while critically assessing the quality of evidence according to established standards in evidence-informed policymaking.
The first component of this study consists of a systematic review of determinants of misconduct that included 343 articles. Determinants were extracted and harmonized through iterative merging of synonymous terms, arriving at 71 determinants. They were then integrated into a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) following the ESC-DAG framework, visually representing both causal claims and quality of supporting evidence. The graph is also enriched with metadata in addition to a convenient access to the reference supporting each causal link. This form of visual representation highlighted multiple factors which lack consensus such as the role of gender, the poor or even counterproductive effectiveness of RI training, the role of scientific productivity and the difficulty of rigorously studying the "publish or perish" pressure.
The second component develops a typology of methodologies employed to investigate the determinants. We distinguished direct surveys, proxy surveys, scenario-based instruments, case studies, simulations, observational studies, and randomized controlled trials. Analysis inspired by GRADE's hierarchy of evidence strength reveal that the field heavily relies on exploratory methodologies that offer limited confirmatory value. While surveys and theoretical simulations are useful for generating hypotheses, only observational studies currently provide preliminary confirmatory insights. However, they are still limited by their reliance on imperfect proxies.
By combining a causal synthesis through a DAG with a methodological typology grounded in evidence quality frameworks, this study offers an overview of current factors involved in research misconducts and the research practices used to study them. This also gives a roadmap for transitioning from exploratory to confirmatory and intervention-based research for better informed policies on research integrity.

The Conference That Wasn't: IEEE's Investigation into a Paper Mill Operation

Dr. Amanda Sulicz[1], *Dr. Luigi Longobardi*[1]
[1]*IEEE, New York, USA*

Objective
Deceptive publication practices continue to threaten the integrity of scholarly communication. Paper mills have become more sophisticated, beyond falsified journal submissions, and have started to exploit the conference publishing ecosystem by operating under the guise of legitimate academic conferences to disseminate fabricated research. This talk will present a case study from IEEE's investigation into one such organization, which ultimately led to the retraction of the entire conference's proceedings.

Methods
IEEE conducted a detailed review of the conference and its published proceedings. The investigation examined submission patterns, peer review documentation, author correspondence, and the conference's publicly available materials. Evidence was assessed to identify indicators of systematic manipulation and to distinguish between author-level misconduct and coordinated organizational fraud.

Results
The investigation revealed systematic and coordinated misconduct, including the submission of falsified manuscripts and the fabrication of peer review reports. Following notification of retraction, correspondence showed a centralized operation managing author communication, including majority of authors using one of two templated response letters. This post-publication defense strategy illustrated an orchestrated effort by the organizers to deflect responsibility from the authors and preserve the appearance of legitimate scholarship. Examination of the conference website and related content exposed inconsistencies and additional indicators of illegitimacy consistent with paper-mill activity.

Conclusion
The findings from this case provide a set of practical warning signs and vetting procedures for publishers and conference organizers. Lessons learned from IEEE's experience underscore the need for careful review and cross-sector collaboration to uphold the integrity of conference publishing and the broader scholarly record.

Insights into Data Integrity in Genetics through a Decade of Retractions

Ms. Tanvi Singh[1]
[1]*National Centre for Biological Sciences, Bengaluru, India*

Objective
investigate how retractions in genetics reflect gaps in data accuracy and reliability. By studying 8,437 retracted genetics papers (in past decade), this work explores how data integrity issues affect the traceability and reproducibility of genetic research, and why maintaining clear, verifiable data practices is essential for preserving trust in scientific findings.

Method
A dataset of 8,437 genetics-related retractions is extracted from the Retraction Watch database. Bibliometric mapping using OpenAlex and VOSviewer identified research trends and disciplinary knowledge gaps. Quantitative analysis in R (tidyverse) will assess temporal and geographic patterns, while text-based analysis (quanteda) will code retraction causes and build integrity-linked networks.

Results
Preliminary analyses show that genetics accounts for a substantial share of bioscience retractions, with 8,437 of 22,460 records identified in the Retraction Watch database. Bibliometric mapping using OpenAlex and VOSviewer indicates that while research on integrity has expanded, discussions remain largely centered on policy and misconduct rather than data reliability in experimental sciences like genetics. Early examination of the dataset suggests frequent issues involving image manipulation, data duplication, and unreliable sequencing data, pointing to persistent weaknesses in data handling and reporting.
Ongoing quantitative analyses in R will assess temporal and geographic patterns to determine periods or regions associated with higher retraction activity, while text-based coding will classify retraction causes by type and severity of integrity breach. These analyses are expected to be completed by the end of this year. The final phase will involve building a network linking retraction reasons, affected subfields, and publication years to trace systemic gaps in data reliability. The completed study will provide empirical insight into how data integrity lapses shape the reproducibility and traceability of genetic research, helping identify key points for improving data governance and reinforcing research integrity practices within the life sciences.

Conclusion
This study underscores the central role of data integrity and traceability in sustaining trust in genetic research. While preliminary trends reveal recurring data-related retractions, the final analysis will clarify systemic causes and inform practical improvements in data governance. Limitations include incomplete metadata and evolving database coverage, which will be addressed in subsequent updates

Research Integrity Screening and Resolutions - An Adaptive, Interventional Approach

Mr. Michael Streeter[1], *Dr. Elizabeth Moylan*[1], *Mrs. Joyce Griffin*[1], *Mr. Ben Dickinson*[1], *Mr Michael Willis*[1]
[1]*Wiley, USA*

In response to the increasing threat posed by paper mills and systematic manipulation, many publishers are growing and standardising their AI-driven screening approaches across journal portfolios. Such approaches aim to protect researchers by ensuring integrity in published articles through the identification of honest errors; they also allow journals to act on systematic concerns. At the same time, journals and publishers recognise that AI-driven screening, on its own, is not enough to resolve integrity breaches; specialist integrity team intervention is required to support appropriate actions against screening outcomes.

At Wiley, following our learning from tackling systematic manipulation at scale, we are applying an adaptive approach to research integrity screening and resolutions based on indicators for potential increased risk in a journal or a set of journals. Such indicators may include evidence derived from screening of targeted attacks, in addition to other considerations such as a journal's scope, article output and changes in submission volumes, business model and editorial structure.

Taking the significance of these indicators together, a specialist research integrity team provides strategic value as they bring context, experience, and expertise to the interpretation of screening outputs. We can deploy an enhanced screening approach utilizing our specialist research integrity team not only to recommend appropriate actions, but to audit journal workflows and identify gaps that require solutions and intervention to safeguard against future integrity breaches. We will present data demonstrating how an interventional approach can strengthen publishing integrity when specific breaches or indicators of systematic manipulation are identified.

Adopting an agile approach to screening with enhanced support where necessary enables publishers to focus resources on journals that are either at high risk or currently facing active threats. It also supports diverse publishing portfolios and recognises the need for different levels of publisher-level intervention. Resolving research integrity concerns at scale, and in close collaboration with all stakeholders, is essential to driving collective progress. By aligning enhanced screening needs with policies, best practices and editorial workflows we are building a robust approach to safeguarding research integrity for the future.

Can Large Language Models Be Trusted to Assess Peer Review Quality?

*Dr. Negar Arabzadeh[1], Sajad Ebrahimi[1], Soroosh Sadeghian[1], **Dr. Mohammad Hosseini**[1], Hai Son Le[1], Ali Ghorbanpour[1], Mahdi Bashari[1], Dr Ebrahim Bagheri[1]*
[1]Reviewerly, Toronto, Canada

Objective
Peer review is central to maintaining research integrity, yet its quality is highly variable and difficult to assess at scale. With the rise of large language models (LLMs), there is growing interest in using them as evaluators of peer reviews. However, it remains unclear whether LLMs can provide reliable judgments compared to simpler machine learning models trained on structured, deterministic features. Our study investigates the extent to which we can rely on LLMs for assessing peer review quality.

Methods
We conducted a large-scale study on over 55,000 peer reviews from open computer science venues. To assess review quality, we developed a modular framework that integrates three categories of evaluation signals: (i) structured, quantifiable metrics derived from review text and reviewer profiles, (ii) rubric-guided assessments using state-of-the-art large language models, and (iii) supervised prediction models that combine interpretable features with model-based scores. We then benchmarked these approaches against human-annotated data, reviews were scored across 13 dimensions of review quality, such as comprehensiveness, fairness, clarity, and actionability.

Results
Our analysis shows that LLMs achieve only modest alignment with expert human judgments (highest Kendall's $\tau \approx 0.36$ for overall quality). Dimensions such as factuality, politeness, and clarity exhibit especially weak correlations. In contrast, supervised models trained on deterministic features (e.g., review length, section-specific references, topical alignment, politeness, hedging) consistently outperform both zero-shot and fine-tuned LLMs, with a simple two-layer multilayer perceptron achieving the strongest correlation with human scores. These findings suggest that interpretable features grounded in theory provide more reliable and generalizable signals of peer review quality than current LLMs, even when fine-tuned. Hybrid systems that combine structured features with LLM-based rubric scores further enhance performance, offering scalable yet interpretable auditing.

Conclusion
Our results highlight the limitations of relying on LLMs as autonomous judges of peer review quality and emphasize the enduring value of simple, transparent metrics. For research integrity, automated review quality assessment must balance scalability with interpretability. We advocate for hybrid frameworks that integrate LLMs with structured features and supervised calibration, ensuring that peer review remains trustworthy, auditable, and aligned with human editorial standards.

From Margins to Centre: Integrating Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and Ethical Frameworks for Better Research

Dr. Krista Holmes[1], ***Robyn Saaltink***[2]
[1]*George Brown College, Toronto, Canada,* [2]*Queen's University, Kingston, Canada*

It is widely recognized that systemic barriers limit the participation of women and marginalized groups in Canada's research ecosystem, with lower rates of academic appointment, secured funding, pay, mentorship, and training opportunities. The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada acknowledges that incorporating Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) in research promotes excellence, relevance to society as a whole, and fuels innovation. It protects communities and promotes equitable distribution of benefits. It benefits communities impacted by research, including those historically harmed by research, and fosters belonging and inclusion for participants. Generally speaking, a lack of confidence in addressing EDI challenges coupled with a lack of relevant learning and resources has acted as a barrier for broadly incorporating EDI frameworks into research methodology across disciplines, particularly in disciplines that have not historically prioritized EDI in practice. At the same time, in many jurisdictions, research involving human participants or their data must adhere to ethical and integrity policies, with oversight in place to support observance. In Canada, researchers and institutions are required to follow the Tri Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research involving Humans (TCPS 2, 2022). Working from the premise that EDI principles are imperative components of research integrity, this presentation will explore intersections between research integrity, ethical frameworks and EDI principles as they relate to research with human participants. Presenters will draw on examples from the Canadian context to illustrate how ethical research design, review, and implementation can - and should - incorporate principles of EDI, and provide strategies and approaches for embedding EDI considerations into research practice. In addition, participants will be encouraged to share their perspectives from other jurisdictions, contributing to an ongoing discussion about gaps and needs that will inform the development of future EDI-related tools, resources, professional development opportunities, and advocacy efforts for researchers and research administrators.

A Comprehensive Evaluation of Methods to Detect Fabricated Clinical Trials Using Baseline Data

Mr. Calvin Heal[1], *Mr. Jamie Kirkham*[1], *Dr Jack Wilkinson*[1]
[1]*Centre for Biostatistics, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK, Manchester, United Kingdom*

Objective
While we know that tests of baseline (im)balance are invalid for the purposes for which they are often employed (selecting covariates for adjustment in trial analysis or considering the presence of 'random confounding'), they may nonetheless be useful as part of a holistic assessment of authenticity. These tests are usually based on the paper's summary information ('Table 1') and are used frequently in determining the authenticity of data in RCTs. They generally test the distribution of p-values derived from statistical comparisons between trial groups at baseline, given that (with true randomisation) this distribution should be uniform. Currently used methods are largely univariate and therefore subject to various assumptions that may limit their usefulness. Correlation between baseline variables, rounding of p-values, and the presence of categorical variables may limit applicability. Multivariate methods, such as Hotelling T2, may overcome some of these limitations, though implementation requires individual participant data (IPD). We aimed to evaluate methods for identifying signs of inauthenticity in randomisation using baseline variables. We determined whether implementing multivariate testing methods using IPD allows a relaxing of the assumptions of summary-level methods.

Methods
We simulated data to emulate clinical trials under six scenarios: genuine block randomisation, genuine stratified randomisation, compromised randomisation, partial fabrication, full fabrication, and fabrication using a large language model. For each scenario we altered various data-generating mechanisms such as sample/variable size and correlation strength, leading to 2809 different sets of simulated RCT data. To these we applied 36 different combinations of statistical methods (including methods to both calculate individual variable p-values and combine these into a study-level value, as well as 'single-stage' methods such as multivariate and other novel approaches). we evaluated how often each method resulted in a correct classification of "genuine" or "not genuine" data".

Results
We will present a comparison of method performance across scenarios and will make recommendations for use of these methods in real integrity investigations.

Conclusion
Understanding which tests are most effective under different circumstances will inform the future of integrity assessment of RCTs, whether summary or IPD is available.

Restorative Justice Talking Circles as a Tool for Promoting Research Integrity

Dr. Emily Hazlett[1], *J.L. Ariansen*[1], *Dr. Monica Lemmon*[1]
[1]*Duke University, Durham, USA*

Restorative Justice comprises a set of principles and practices rooted in community, shared by humanity, and often associated with criminal justice in the United States. These practices are being explored by multiple universities and scientific communities across the world as a tool to address the harms of research misconduct (Wild, 2024). In addition to addressing harms caused, restorative practices are a potential tool for cultivation of a workplace culture promoting research integrity. At Duke University, all faculty and staff engaged in research must complete interactive Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) trainings. Our office – the Duke Office of Scientific Integrity – has incorporated restorative practices in select RCR trainings designed to foster a sense of safety and connection among participants in addition to knowledge building on a RCR topic. Specifically, about ten researchers gather as a small, in-person group. Chairs are positioned in a circle so that researchers see and engage with each other while speaking. Two trained facilitators lead the group through a series of reflective questions related to an RCR topic and invite the researchers to share experiences and perspectives. When one person is speaking, the others are asked to actively listen. Our aim with these trainings is to facilitate deep engagement with challenging topics as part of ongoing efforts to enhance research culture and promote ethical practices. While requirements for RCR trainings have been in place for decades (Kalichman, 2007), evidence supporting their effectiveness is lacking (Powell et al., 2007). We believe that incorporating restorative justice practices into RCR trainings is a promising avenue for increasing long-term impact on ethical decision-making through the centering of shared experiences in research.

SIMPLIFY – Building a European Coordination Platform for Research Ethics and Integrity

Ms. Lisa Häberlein[1], *Dr. Panagiotis Kavouras*[2]
[1]*EUREC Office, Bonn, Germany,* [2]*HEAL-Link Office, Library & Information Center, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece*

In an era of rapid digitalisation, global collaboration, and emerging technologies, researchers and institutions face growing challenges in navigating across rapidly evolving ethical standards and finding up-to-date answers to pressing questions of responsible research practice. Despite the abundance of valuable research ethics and integrity resources—frameworks, tools, and training modules developed through numerous European and international initiatives—it remains challenging to gain an overarching view, and their implementation across institutions is often inconsistent. Bridging the gap between availability and implementation is crucial to ensure that this collective knowledge translates into everyday research practice and helps build trust and excellence in research.

SIMPLIFY (Supporting Institutions in Managing Procedures for Lasting ethics and Integrity Frameworks and policY) responds to this challenge as the operational platform of the ERA Action 18 under the European Research Area Policy Agenda 2025–2027. The project brings together six leading European networks—EUREC, ENRIO, ALLEA, EARMA, ENAI, and The Embassy of Good Science—to co-create sustainable frameworks, training pathways, and certification models that translate European ethics and integrity principles into daily research practice.

Focusing on the evolving ethical dimensions of research, SIMPLIFY addresses ERA priority areas including trustworthy AI and digitalisation, research security and emerging technologies, academic freedom and international collaboration, and the protection of children in virtual environments. Therewith, its work directly speaks to the WCRI 2026 themes: developing guidance and case-based training on the responsible use of AI, supporting institutions in balancing openness and security, and promoting ethical pluralism through dialogue across epistemic and cultural traditions.

Rooted in a broad Community of Practice, SIMPLIFY connects ethics committees, integrity offices, research managers, funders, academies, learned societies, libraries, citizen science actors, and policymakers through joint learning, piloting, and exchange. Within this network, participants support one another through peer learning, co-creation, and hands-on piloting to build capacity, adapt tools to own contexts, and prepare for implementation—turning shared principles into practice.

This oral presentation will introduce SIMPLIFY and invite the global research integrity community to engage—by joining its Community of Practice, becoming peer mentors in job-shadowing and mutual learning activities, certified trainers, or pilot institutions that help shape Europe's shared ethics and integrity future.

Ethics Pendulum: Institutional Research Integrity Dynamics in Ghanaian Universities

Dr. Pearl Hammond[1], *Mr Nyamawero Navel*[2]
[1]*University of Education, Winneba, Winneba, Ghana,* [2]*University of Education, Winneba, Ghana*

Objective
Research integrity is fundamental to credible academic contributions in universities worldwide. While extensively explored in Western contexts, the institutional dynamics shaping research ethics within African universities, remain underexplored. This study fills the research gap by examining how institutional structures, policies, and cultures influence research integrity practices within Ghanaian public universities.

Method
A qualitative multiple case study of six (6) Ghanaian public universities and Ghana Tertiary Education Commission (GTEC) was conducted. Heterogeneous purposive sampling was employed to capture six different institutional profiles. Data collection involved in-depth interviews with institutional Directors/Heads of Research Integrity and a comprehensive review of institutional research policy documents, analysed thematically.

Results
The investigation uncovered a complex and irregularly established research ethics environment within the six(6) public universities in Ghana. Although ethics committees are formally present in each of the universities, their operational effectiveness is significantly limited by scarce resources, varying understandings of official guidelines, and erratic supervisory practices. A considerable divergence exists between established policy documents and their implementation in everyday research activities. Furthermore, critical external pressures, including the imperative for career progression, intense competition for scarce funding, and the demand for publications, exacerbate ethical challenges. These pressures frequently lead to the compromised application of fundamental principles, notably concerning informed consent and proper data management. Despite these systemic hurdles and the notable absence of an overarching national policy structure, the study observed that certain robust, positive practices manage to endure within the university setting.

Conclusion
The study concludes that research integrity within the six(6) Ghanaian public universities is dynamic but unstable. This precarious state results from deep-seated systemic barriers and the critical absence of a coherent national policy, causing practices to oscillate inconsistently between strong commitment and unavoidable compromise, thereby undermining research ethical consistency.

Keywords: Ethics Pendulum, Institutional Dynamics, Public Universities in Ghana, Research Integrity, Research Policy.

Fragmented Governance, Ill-Fitting Models, and Limited Resources: The Challenges of Ethics Review in Social Sciences and Humanities in Europe

Prof. Hella von Unger[1], *Prof. Ioannis Manos*[2], *Dr. des. Anna Huber*[1], *Ms Nevien Kerk*[1], *Dr. Antonija Mijatović*[3], *Prof. Constantin Vică*[4], *Alexandra Zorilă*[4], *Marija Franka Zuljevic*[3], *Dr. Marjo Rauhala*[5], *Dr. Vasiliki Mollaki*[6], *Prof. Ana Marušić*[3]

[1]*LMU Munich, Munich, Germany,* [2]*University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki, Greece,* [3]*University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia,* [4]*Research Centre in Applied Ethics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania,* [5]*TU Wien, Vienna, Austria,* [6]*National Centre for Scientific Research "Demokritos" (NCSRD), Athens, Greece*

Background

Systems of ethics governance, including institutional ethics reviews, have faced criticism since their introduction, particularly in the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). Nevertheless, recent decades have seen a steady expansion of regulatory ethics in the SSH across various European countries.

Aim

This paper examines key challenges in the current state of research ethics in the SSH in Europe, drawing on empirical data from the EU-funded CHANGER project, which explores challenges and innovative solutions for ethics review across disciplines and European Union (EU) member states.

Methods

As part of a stakeholder consultation, expert interviews and focus groups were conducted in 2024–2025 with 78 participants from various EU countries, including researchers, members of Research Ethics Committees (RECs), and EU ethics experts. The qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis, with the present analysis focusing specifically on perspectives from the SSH.

Findings: Four central areas of concern were identified.

(1) There are relatively new, fragmented, and uneven structures of ethics governance across EU countries, compounded by a lack of resources, support, and recognition for the work of RECs.

(2) There is a limited fit between the biomedical legacy of procedural ethics and SSH research practices, methodologies, and epistemologies. These frictions are particularly evident in tensions between the ex-ante review model and the evolving nature of qualitative SSH research and other emerging study designs, as well as in challenges in applying biomedical models of informed consent — for example, in social media or ethnographic research.

(3) The expansion of stakeholder involvement and collaborative formats, such as participatory research, raises additional ethical questions and calls for more responsive and inclusive ethics frameworks.

(4) New ethical issues emerge from digital data and emerging technologies, including AI-based approaches.

Conclusions

Research ethics in the SSH requires context-sensitive approaches tailored to specific disciplines and methodologies. Such approaches should move beyond compliance to foster ethical reflexivity among researchers, while complementing formalized ethics reviews with peer consultation and promoting ethics training, broader consultation, and community involvement.

Intersection of Research Security and Research Integrity: Insights from ENRIO

*Dr. Helene Ingierd[1], Dr. Michaela Lenčéšová[2], Dr. Loreta Tauginienė[3], **Dr. Nathalie Voarino**[4]*
[1]National Research Ethics Committees (NREC), Norway, [2]the Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic, [3]Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania, [4]The French Office of Research Integrity, France

Research security is a concept that has received increasing attention within the global research ecosystem. Although some attempts have been made to show the linkage between research security and research integrity, the definition of research security and its relationship to research integrity remain unclear. A survey, carried out by the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO), focusing on mapping and developing key definitions (n=25), found that research security is rarely defined in national guidance documents we reviewed. However, approximately one-third of ENRIO members reported the use of terms closely related to research security, such as safety and security, institutional resilience, dual-use research of concern, and knowledge security. Our findings suggest that research security is a broad and multifaceted concept encompassing physical safety, data protection, academic freedom, and institutional responsibility.
This presentation outlines a normative analysis of research security conducted as part of the ENRIO-project. Building on the survey results, our normative analysis explicates research security in the light of principles outlined in key documents, such as The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA), The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity (WCRI), and selected scholarly literature. In policy documents, research security is broadly understood as the prevention of the misuse of research and technology in ways that threaten societal or national security, violate ethical standards, or infringe upon core academic values. However, the concept is not yet fully reflected in existing normative frameworks on research integrity. Based on our analysis, we propose adjustments to key frameworks to better account for emerging understandings of research security and its intersection with research integrity.

Use of Experts in Research: Systematic Review and Research Integrity Framework

Dr. Lesley Uttley[1], *Ms Louise Falzon*[1], *Prof Nicholas Latimer*[1], *Dr. Lesley Uttley*[1], *Prof Shijie Ren*[1]
[1]*University of Sheffield, United Kingdom*

Objectives
Expert input is a common source of evidence in research, particularly when empirical data are sparse or uncertain. Yet the methods and reporting of how experts are consulted, and views are synthesised vary widely. This heterogeneity introduces potential biases, inequity, and opacity, undermining both research integrity and the legitimacy of downstream decision-making. We systematically reviewed approaches to consulting experts in research, classified the methods, their characteristics and reporting practices. We propose a framework to support integrity in expert consultation which is transferable across disciplines.

Methods
This project was registered a priori (https://osf.io/t94xk/). We performed a systematic review of studies reporting methods to incorporate expert opinion in health technology assessment (HTA). Eligible studies were empirical published academic research articles published after 2000. Extracted data were categorised by the type and method of incorporation of expert opinion. We conducted a survey of methodologists for feedback on the categories of expert opinion generated from the systematic review and from this, developed a framework for methods of using expert opinion in research.

Results
Following literature searches and screening, 23 empirical studies that employed expert input in HTA were included. Six distinct methods of expert consultation were identified, including 1) individual expert consultation, 2) consulting multiple experts through surveys or interviews, 3) expert consensus panels, 4) Delphi methods, 5) expert elicitation using ad hoc methods and 6) structured expert elicitation protocols. Most studies underreported critical factors, including how experts were selected and methods from aggregation of inputs. Moderating factors such as group dynamics, interpersonal and motivating factors, and facilitation practices were rarely acknowledged yet can influence the credibility of expert-derived estimates. Assessment of study quality found that planning/protocols and data sharing were frequently omitted. We present the many dimensions assessed in this review using a coherent framework promoting transparency, inclusivity, rigour, and objectivity when consulting experts in research.

Conclusion
By addressing risks of undue influences and ensuring inclusivity and transparency, this research integrity framework for expert consultation has the potential to increase the scientific integrity when incorporating expert input into research for decision making.

Who Wrote This? Evaluating the Reliability of AI-Detection Tools in Higher Education

Ms. Marijke Van Vlasselaer[1], *Prof Filip Van Droogenbroeck*[1], *Prof Bram Spruyt*[1]
[1]*Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium*

Abstract
The widespread and increasing adoption of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in higher education has raised urgent questions about academic integrity and the reliability of AI detection tools used in high-stakes assessments.

Objective
This study compares the accuracy of four popular detection tools: GPTZero, Pangram, Copyleaks, and Turnitin on four kinds of academic papers: fully human-written, fully AI-written, hybrid (human with GenAI-inserted passages), and humanised GenAI (AI-written passages rewritten to look like authentic student writing).

Methods
Using a synthetic dataset of 160 documents with known ground truth values, we assessed each tool's detection accuracy.

Results
Results show that Pangram consistently performed better than the other tools, achieving high accuracy in detecting fully AI-generated, hybrid, and humanised texts. In contrast, the other tools significantly underestimated GenAI content, particularly for texts generated with the most advanced model. All tools correctly identified fully human texts. To conduct a real world test, Pangram was applied to 1,163 master's theses submitted in 2024–2025, identifying 45.5% for possible AI-generated content, most with low to moderate GenAI involvement. False positives were rare across all tools, suggesting improvement compared to earlier studies.

Conclusion
Findings show that while detection tools can provide useful initial flags, they should not be used as sole evidence in high-stakes decision-making but should be implemented in a broader evaluation strategy.

Keywords: AI detection tools, higher education, plagiarism detection, assessment policy, academic integrity, generative artificial intelligence

Ensuring Research Integrity When Employing AI-Assisted Research Methodologies

Prof. Anné Verhoef[1]
[1]*North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa*

With the advent of generative AI, a new research methodology has emerged: the AI-Assisted Research Methodology. This approach is employed when artificial intelligence facilitates the generation of new knowledge. While this methodology demonstrates the potential of AI as a valuable tool that can enhance research quality, concerns regarding the integrity of such research persist. In this presentation, I will provide an overview of six key ways in which AI-assisted research methodologies can enhance scientific inquiry. Subsequently, I will examine the ethical and responsible use of AI in relation to each of these concepts. The six ways in which AI can enhance research are:

1. Encouraging the formulation of appropriate research questions.
2. Facilitating the generation of innovative ideas.
3. Serving as a valuable and novel source of information.
4. Integrating into research methodologies as a collaborative partner.
5. Supporting rigorous scientific knowledge production.
6. Introducing new guidelines within the research landscape.

Firstly, AI helps researchers develop more effective research questions, as they can now use AI to assess and refine their proposed inquiries. Can the AI provide a satisfactory response? If so, does the answer demonstrate sufficient depth, or is further refinement needed? If AI can readily answer the question, it may indicate a need to revise the inquiry or explore additional dimensions. This iterative process of testing and refining questions with AI support continues until a meaningful and valuable research question is developed. To use AI ethically and responsibly in this first step means to:

- Prioritise creating new knowledge over simply earning credentials.
- Utilise specialised AI tools for specific queries rather than only general chatbots.
- Always verify AI's responses, as inaccuracies can occur.
- Maintain your individual perspective and interests throughout the process.
- Address data safety early by reviewing relevant settings.

For the remaining five steps, I have outlined specific principles for the ethical and responsible use of AI to safeguard research integrity. These concepts have been evaluated by several researchers and received positive feedback from the AI Circle in South Africa for Higher Education (AICSA). However, further validation at an international level is necessary.

What the Evidence and Analysis of Research Organisations' Annual Statements Tell Us About Research Integrity in the UK

Mrs. Rebecca Mrs Veitch[1], ***Ms. Sue Russell***[2]
[1]*UKRI, United Kingdom,* [2]*Wellcome, United Kingdom*

Upholding, rewarding, and continuously improving responsible research practice is a collective endeavour. One of the key expectations of UK research organisations is to publish an annual statement on research integrity to demonstrate accountability and continuous improvement. This expectation is set within the UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity, the UK's framework for research practice which unites the research community, employers and funders under a common set of principles.

This session will review the importance of these statements for organisational and national support of research integrity. The presentation will explore what two national analyses of annual statements tells us about how organisations approach research integrity in the UK, and how this has changed over time.

The presenters will discuss why a template was introduced for writing annual statements, and how data collected from statements has informed knowledge about policies, processes and training at a system level. They will discuss how and why the template was revised across 2025-2026, reflecting feedback from the research community on how it could be improved to foster continuous improvement for individual organisations and for the UK.

The presenters will share overall reflections on the value of the statements to a range of stakeholders (national bodies, funders, research organisations). They will discuss:

- opportunities to celebrate and share case studies and lessons learned on the ways organisations support their communities
- the balance that was sought between showcasing good research practices and transparency about research misconduct
- the pros and cons of making the template mandatory, considering how the statements contribute to system-level accountability.

The presentation will finish with a discussion about how annual statements contribute to transparency within the UK system, supporting local and global collaboration.

A Scoping Review of Empirical Research on Post-Retraction Citation

Prof. Will White[1], ***Dr. Caitlin Bakker***[2], ***Dr. Jodi Schneider***[3], *Yuanxi Fu*[4], *Dr. Susmita Das*, *Tzu-Kun Hsiao*[4], *Jess Rogovin*[5]

[1]*University of New Mexico Health Sciences Library and Informatics Center, Albuquerque, USA,* [2]*University of Regina, Regina, Canada,* [3]*University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, USA,* [4]*University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, USA,* [5]*Mayo Clinic, Rochester, USA*

Objective

This scoping review examines post-retraction citations as a proxy for epistemic risk (i.e., the likelihood that one holds a false or inaccurate belief). It aims to describe the current landscape of empirical research on post-retraction citation, with the specific aim of determining the extent of epistemic risk and describing how that risk may manifest and result in epistemic harm.

Methods

Our study uses Arksey and O'Malley's scoping review framework for scoping reviews (2005). We searched the published literature in scholarly databases using a combination of controlled vocabulary and natural language searching, and by hand-searching the Empirical Retraction Lit bibliography <https://infoqualitylab.org/projects/risrs2020/bibliography/>. Our inclusion and exclusion criteria were based upon our two primary research questions: RQ1: Given post-retraction citation as a proxy for epistemic risk, what is the extent of epistemic risk as captured in the current body of literature? RQ2: In those articles that describe epistemic harm, how is epistemic harm manifesting? We included reports of empirical research about citations to retracted studies which occurred post-retraction in scholarly materials. All items were screened by two researchers independently in title, abstract, and full text-phases, and discrepancies were resolved through consensus. We registered our protocol via OSF <https://osf.io/jxha8>.

Results

Our initial searches retrieved over 8,500 items, of which over 200 were included following full-text screening. The included studies were published between 1923 and 2025, and were most frequently published in Scientometrics, Accountability in Research, and PLoS One. Of the included items, the most frequently represented subject areas were within the health sciences. Many studies were primarily descriptive, and analysis of citation sentiment or acknowledgement of retraction was variable. Epistemic harm was inconsistently analyzed in the studies. When mentioned, examples included potential impact on patient care, attention through social media, and subsequent funding and research directions.

Conclusion

This scoping review highlights a large yet fragmented body of empirical literature on post-retraction citation. We found that studies repeatedly address similar descriptive questions and offer preliminary assessments of epistemic risk with less substantive engagement with epistemic harm. Upon completion, our scoping review will be submitted to the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology.

Unraveling the 'Spin' and Selective Reporting in Medical AI Research: A Cross-Sectional Meta-Research Study

Mr. Vincent Yuan[1], *Dr Aidan Tan*[2]
[1]*School of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia, Sydney, Australia,* [2]*Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia, Sydney, Australia*

Objective
Too often in scientific research, the story told in a paper is not the full story. Some researchers may present their findings in a way that misleads readers. This phenomenon is known as 'spin', and includes misrepresenting results or selectively focusing on abstract conclusions. As medical artificial intelligence (AI) features more prominently in research, understanding the extent of spin in this field is critical.

We aimed to determine the prevalence, types and facilitators of 'spin' and other selective reporting practices in recently published medical AI research.

Methods
This was a cross-sectional meta-research study of interventional and observational studies related to medical AI. Medical AI was defined as computational models (e.g., machine learning and natural language processing) which amplify or augment healthcare-related tasks (e.g., diagnosis, prognosis and risk stratification). Studies were identified by searching MEDLINE, Embase, and the Cochrane Library. Studies were included if they were observational or interventional studies related to medical AI and published in 2023, English language and full-text. One reviewer collected data and where there was uncertainty, a second reviewer independently recollected the data.

Results
423 studies were included. Just over a third (35%, 149/423) of studies described AI as superior to the comparator. Almost one in ten studies (9%, 38/423) contained leading words in the title, and over half (56%, 236/423) selectively focused abstract conclusions on significant results. In almost half (48%, 203/423) of studies abstracts, qualifiers (e.g., "might", "very") were present to subtly suggest stronger findings than likely warranted. The majority (71%, 300/423) of studies contained strong statements (e.g., adverbs such as "clearly shows") in the body to emphasise the AI model's performance, accuracy or effectiveness. Almost a quarter (24%, 101/423) of studies made recommendations for clinical practice in the body, without external validation in the same study.

Conclusion
Our findings suggest that selective reporting practices, including spin, are prevalent in medical AI research. These practices can misinform readers of the technical performance and real-world applicability of AI tools. This is crucial for titles and abstracts, as these sections often influence first impressions and inform clinical decision-making.

Exploring Conceptions of Epistemic Diversity in Scholarly Publishing

Ms. Sarah Patricia Wendt[1]
[1]*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany*

Objective
Scholarly publishing has been criticized for perpetuating inequities in global knowledge production through its epistemologically exclusive character. I explore how publishers address this critique in their diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) policies by analyzing underlying conceptions of epistemic diversity through a critical lens.

Method
I conduct a qualitative content analysis of publicly available DEI policy documents of four different publishers, drawing on the Critical Diversity Literacy (CDL) framework by Steyn et al. (2020) for the analysis of organizational change. I subsequently compare the organizational settings of the four different publishers: commercial, non-commercial, society publishing, and one publisher focused on indigenous knowledges.

Results
From a CDL perspective, the analyzed commercial, non-commercial and society publishers uphold similar conceptions of epistemic diversity that maintain exclusive epistemological structures in their DEI policies. While the availability of vast DEI-related materials, including training of editorial staff, demographic data studies and monitoring strategies, reflexive blog posts, signals openness for change, publishers adhere to what Sara Ahmed (2007) terms the “business model” of diversity. Most analyzed DEI measures focus on representation in the sense of social diversity, e.g. by promoting more geographical and gender diversity among reviewers and editorial boards. In this, they lack recognition and specification of strategies for facilitating epistemic diversity. They further refrain from the language and logic of social and epistemic justice, largely ignoring the historical and political dimensions of academic knowledge production, leaving current unequal power relations unchallenged. Some recent individual measures show potential of more critical DEI engagement, such as collectivizing transformative efforts and partnerships with Southern actors. The additional comparison with the publisher explicitly focused on communicating indigenous knowledges is still in progress at the moment of abstract submission and will potentially serve as a contrasting case.

Conclusion
DEI efforts can either reproduce epistemic exclusion or open up new possibilities for transforming the publishing landscape, depending on the critical capacity of their epistemic frameworks. Publishers can learn from critical scholarship and decolonization initiatives how to integrate a conception of epistemic diversity grounded in social and epistemic justice and how to translate such conceptions into equitable practice.

Exploring Fairness in Global North-Global South Research Collaborations: Insights from Researchers' Lived Experiences

Ms. Claudia Pallise Perello[1], ***Dr. Langelihle Mlotshwa***[2], *Amber Vouter*[1], *Prof. Mariëtte Van Den Hoven*[1], *Dr. Natalie Evans*[1]
[1]*Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, Netherlands,* [2]*Wits University, Johannesburg, South Africa*

Objective
Global Health (GH) research collaborations between the Global North (GN) and Global South (GS) can be mutually beneficial, yet they can also become contexts in which injustices, power dynamics and colonial hierarchies manifest. This study explores how researchers from the GN and GS conceptualize and experience fairness in GN-GS research collaborations, and how their lived experiences can inform institutional research policies.

Methods
This qualitative study is based on in-depth semi-structured interviews with researchers who have experience in GN-GS collaborations. Participants were recruited through purposive sampling. Using a Critical Thematic Analysis, informed by critical literature, we examined how power positions, colonial hierarchies, structural inequalities and ideologies manifest in the discourses and lived experiences of researchers.

Results
This study includes 40 participants from GN and GS, from diverse GH disciplines and seniority. GN researchers were affiliated with Dutch institutions and GS researchers were based in GS institutions which collaborated with either Dutch or European institutions. The sample includes also researchers whose trajectories fall out of the GN-GS binary (e.g., individuals born in the GS, trained in the GN, and conducting research across both contexts).
Preliminary findings show persistent colonial structural inequalities in GN-GS collaborations. Participants identified fairness barriers rooted in GN control over funding, agenda setting, and decision-making, which leads to constraints in GS researchers' agency, resources, and epistemic recognition. Beyond structural imbalances, power manifestations also were identified in specific research processes including GN dominance in authorship, extractivism of GS data, imposition of GN ethical rules, and control over GS communities and research actors. Participants also suggested several practices to enhance fairness, including shared leadership between the GN and GS, reporting of power imbalances at the beginning of collaborations, explicit acknowledgment of structural inequalities, trust to GS parties from funding agencies and ongoing reflexivity in all research processes.

Conclusion
This study highlights the persistent ongoing influence of colonial dynamics and systemic inequalities in GN-GS research. It also calls for a shift in these collaborations toward a reflexive, power-aware practice that prioritizes equality, shared decision-making, and structural accountability as essential components of research guidance in these collaborations.

How Peer Pressure Influences Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) in Local and International Collaborative Research in Nigeria

Dr. Anthony Oko-Isu[1,2,3], *Prof Ademola Johnson Ajuwon*[2,3]
[1]*Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu-Alike, Nigeria,* [2]*University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria,* [3]*Centre for Bioethics and Research, Ibadan, Nigeria*

Objective
The study explored the ways in which peer pressure influences the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) in local and international collaborative research environments in Nigeria. It assessed how interpersonal and structural factors impact ethical decision-making, institutional reactions, and integrity outcomes in collaborative environments with resource limitations and hierarchical power structures.

Methods
A qualitative design was applied in two large research institutions—the University of Ibadan (UI) and the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER). Data were collected from four Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with senior research leaders, twenty In-depth Interviews (IDIs) with research and academic staff, and four Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with thirty-six respondents. Reflexive thematic analysis, based on Braun and Clarke, was conducted to establish cross-cutting patterns and institutional contrasts. Triangulation of interviews, focus groups, and document reading was utilized to enhance validity. Ethical approval came from the University of Ibadan Social Science and Humanities Research Ethics Committee (UI-SSHREC/2025/052).

Results
Peer pressure exerted double and context-dependent impacts on RCR. Positive frames of reference led to productivity, mentorship, and collaborative learning, but negative pressures led to questionable research practices (QRPs), including authorship manipulation, selective reporting, and data compromise. Promotion-by-publication schemes, rushed timelines, and donor-induced milestones were identified as top ethical risk multipliers. Patronage and hierarchical cultures undermined junior researchers' autonomy, fostering silence around misconduct for fear of exclusion or retribution. While UI had relatively structured RCR arrangements, enforcement remained weak; NISER relied heavily on ad hoc ethics management. Parties demanded institutional integrity desks, mandatory RCR training, authorship contracts, and systemic whistleblower protection as practical precautions.

Conclusion
Peer pressure among Nigerian research institutions is a social and structural context that may either facilitate or undermine research integrity. Facilitating RCR requires incentive systems to be aligned with ethical performance, accountability mechanisms to be embedded into collaborative agreements, and mentoring cultures fostered so as to normalize integrity and not compliance. This article presents new empirical evidence from a low- and middle-income context to international debates regarding research security and social determinants of integrity in cross-border research.

Assessing Open Science Practices Among Graduates of the Living Data Project, a Canada-wide Graduate Training Program

Dr. Jason Pither[1,2], *Mathew Vis-Dunbar*[1], *Dr. Sandra Emry*[3,4], *Dr. David Hunt*[5], *Dr. Diane Srivastava*[3,4]

[1]Dept of Biology, University of British Columbia, Okanagan Campus, Kelowna, Canada, [2]Okanagan Institute for Biodiversity, Resilience, and Ecosystem Services, Kelowna, Canada, [3]Dept of Zoology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, [4]Biodiversity Research Centre, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, [5]Canadian Institute for Ecology and Evolution - The Living Data Project, Canada

Despite a growing awareness of low transparency and replicability of research across many scientific disciplines, practices that enhance good research conduct – such as pre-registration and sharing of code and non-sensitive data – remain rare. Insufficient access to suitable training has long been identified as a key barrier. The Living Data Project (LDP), an initiative of the Canadian Institute of Ecology and Evolution funded through Canada's NSERC CREATE program between 2020 and 2026, aims to address this shortfall for graduate students in ecology, evolution, and environmental science across Canada.

The LDP has been unique in offering formal graduate courses to enhance research transparency and replicability, each year providing four 1-credit, synchronous, online modules, each comprising eight 90-minute sessions. Two of these modules focused specifically on training students in the principles and practices of open science, including pre-registrations, sharing code, and following principles for open data discovery and utility (FAIR, doi.org/10.1038%2FSDATA.2016.18). The two other modules addressed complementary skills in synthesis statistics and scientific collaboration. This structured learning environment with peer engagement and interactive discussions provided learning opportunities not covered by existing courses or by self-directed materials, and fostered the building of professional networks in which open science practices became normalized.

To evaluate whether the training provided by the LDP has made a difference, we will conduct a quasi-experimental, matched-groups study, comparing open science indicators (OSIs) in research outputs from students who completed the LDP courses with those from students who did not receive LDP training; the latter matched by institutions, programs, and graduating years. The OSIs include the posting of pre-prints, and the sharing research data, code, protocols, and study registrations (or pre-registration). We will quantify the OSIs among published outputs using established protocols from the Public Library of Science OSI initiative (doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.21640889). We will pre-register our study, and will focus on the first three cohorts of LDP graduates (2020-2022), as these are likely to have had time to yield a sufficient sample size of research outputs. This study will provide a valuable assessment of the real-world impact of structured training in open science.

Using Generative Artificial Intelligence to Teach Research Integrity: An Untapped Opportunity

Dr. Sharon Obasi[1], ***Dr. Chiedozie Ike***
[1]*University of Nebraska at Kearney, Kearney, USA*

The rise of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT is reshaping the landscape of higher education. For many educators, these tools raise legitimate concerns about plagiarism, authorship, and the erosion of academic honesty. Yet generative AI also presents an untapped opportunity: it can be leveraged as a powerful pedagogical tool for teaching research integrity. Rather than viewing AI solely as a threat, this presentation reframes it as a catalyst for innovation in helping students understand, internalize, and apply the principles of ethical scholarship.

Drawing from classroom practice across STEAM disciplines, this session demonstrates strategies for using generative AI to illuminate core aspects of research integrity. For instance, students can critically evaluate AI-generated references, sometimes containing fabricated or incomplete citations, to deepen their understanding of source verification and responsible attribution. Comparing AI-produced summaries with peer-reviewed literature can underscore the importance of accuracy, transparency, and the peer-review process. Finally, guided exploration of how AI blurs traditional notions of authorship and originality can prompt dialogue on intellectual ownership, collaboration, and the evolving role of technology in scholarly work.

Research Integrity Training in Undergraduate Students in Rwandan Universities

Mr. Edouard Ntakirutimana[1]
[1]*University Of Bamberg, Bamberg, Germany,* [2]*Protestant University of Rwanda, Huye, Rwanda*

Objective
The present study was conducted with the objective of examining the issue of research integrity training in Rwandan universities, with a particular focus on the perspectives of the undergraduate students on support received in their research projects.

Method
The presented study employed a qualitative research approach. Based on theoretical sampling, 30 interviews were conducted with undergraduate students from different study programs. The data were analysed using qualitative content analysis. Through the analysis process, the interviews were systematically coded, inter-coded and subjected to abduction process, leading to the generalisation of data.

Results
The results obtained from the study indicate the presence of three distinct types of research integrity training. The first type, designated as “cheating oriented training”, focused on the training of students in unethical research practices, including the misappropriation of others’ papers and the corruption of some teachers for having not deserved research-related services. For this particular type of training, students pay the supervisor or another individual to produce papers on their behalf, thereby facilitating the completion of the requisite formalities for their studies. The second type, entitled “superficial research integrity training”, pertains the superficial follow-up of the students’ research activities by their supervisors. This has been demonstrated empirically to result in the production of low-quality papers production by the students. In the case of this type, the students are not equipped with the requisite research competences. Consequently, they are unable to adhere to the established research guidelines. They tend to compile information to make papers, especially with plagiarism. The third one, entitled “rigorous research integrity training”, is characterised by the active participation of students in their research activities, with support from supervisors through guidance and feedback. This type of training educates students in respecting research ethics and values, helping them to produce high-quality papers.

Conclusion
The training of students on research integrity has been demonstrated to be an effective tool in addressing the issue of unethical practice among the students, particularly in the context of teaching and student research projects supervision. Regrettably, it has been shown that some lecturers may contribute to this unethical practice through their actions.

Leadership, Management, and Mentorship Practices at Atlantic Technological University – Fostering a Culture of Research Integrity to Reshape Supervisor–Supervisee Power Dynamics in Postgraduate Research

Ms. Ruth Moran[1], *Dr. Conor McTiernan*
[1]*Atu Sligo, Sligo, Ireland*

The challenge of ensuring university faculty and post graduate students adhere to standards of equitable, fair, transparent research integrity practices is complex, and inherently challenged by power imbalances between the actors involved. Yet contemporary scholarship posits that appropriate leadership, management, and mentorship (LMM) practices can be designed and employed to ensure all stakeholders in the postgraduate communities positively contribute to research integrity practices that meet international standards and are deemed credible by the wider research eco-system. This conceptual study explores the strategic steps taken in the development of a LLM framework to embed a culture of research integrity at the newly formed Atlantic Technological University (ATU). It explores how LMM practices were shaped cognisant of the power dynamics between the postgraduate supervisor (PGS) and postgraduate supervisees.

As a research focused university, ATU PGSs have professional responsibilities as leaders, managers and mentors to the research institute in which they are based, and to the postgraduate researchers they supervise. Firstly, the PGS as a leader is obliged to adhere to top-down university standards and practices designed to foster a research culture that adheres to international codes of responsible research practices and standards that permeate to their postgraduate students. The PGS is a manager as they equip their supervisee with direction, skills, knowledge and expertise to manage daily research tasks. Finally, the PGS acts as a mentor to students via a bottom-up fostering of a climate of research integrity. Through adherence to professional, ethical and responsible leadership practices, PGSs evidence credibility as role models.

By clearly situating LMM practices as supports for PGSs, the study assists faculty in their responsibilities to fostering a culture of research integrity. LMM can inform supervision practices which determine the veracity of power differentials between actors and the associated management of supervisor-supervisee professional relationships. The study illuminates how transparent university policies and practices buttress the PGS to advance a university-wide culture of research integrity.

Keywords: Postgraduate Supervisor, Postgraduate Supervisee, Research integrity. Power dynamics.

It's the Hidden Curriculum, Stupid!

Dr. Jos Kole[1], ***Dr. Maximiliano Cenci***[1]
[1]*Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, Netherlands*

The importance of formal research integrity education (RI education) is broadly accepted at universities and university medical centers in many countries worldwide. Many research institutes now offer mandatory RI courses, particularly for PhD candidates and early-career researchers. However, the effectiveness of these courses remains debated (Katsarov et al., 2022). Despite this uncertainty, we assume that formal RI education is meaningful and necessary.

Yet, the claim of this article is that paying attention to 'formal' RI education is not enough, given the assumed strong influence of the so called 'hidden curriculum' on the daily academic research work floor. In this conceptual and argumentative paper, we operationalize the term 'hidden curriculum' for research integrity education and explore its potential for the quest after more diverse and (hopefully) effective pedagogical and didactic strategies for RI education.

The phenomenon of 'hidden curriculum' is frequently discussed in literature and research about medical education and refers to "implicit cultural norms, values, and skills that learners gain through observation and interaction with peers and teachers in the work and learning environment." (Li et al, 2024). It was famously introduced in medical education by Hafferty and Franks (1994), although its first use can be traced back to Cowell 1972. By itself, the term 'hidden curriculum' is neutral and may refer to both positive and negative influences on those educated implicitly and informally. In practice, 'hidden curriculum' is regularly associated with the negative influence of unconscious socialisation that undermines the positive impact of formal and explicit teaching. We will briefly discuss how recognition of this negative influence may lead to an argument for mandatory formal training of senior researchers (who often seem to assume that they do not need courses on research integrity).

Although research culture and climate are increasingly recognized as crucial in RI education, insights from medical education's extensive literature on the hidden curriculum have so far been scarcely applied in this field. Drawing from this body of work, we propose initial lessons and outline a research agenda for integrating hidden curriculum perspectives into RI education. We illustrate these ideas with examples from dental research practice.

Capacity Strengthening for Research Regulators in Africa Through an E-Learning Platform for Good Regulatory Practice.

Ms. Rosemary Kamuyu[1], *Dr. Elizabeth Bukusi, Ms. Hellen Opolot, Beth Mutumba, Mrs. Irene Ssemakula, Mr. Samuel Jacob Bengo, Dr Tiwonge Mtande, Dr Bugwesa Katale, Dr. Paul Ochanga*
[1]*Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya*

Research for health in resource-limited settings has grown over the past decade. In Sub-Saharan Africa, number and complexity of clinical trials have increased, with new designs and methods used to evaluate medical interventions including new drugs and vaccines. This growth places pressure on national research oversight systems to remain robust, timely, relevant and current. Core elements of these systems include competent regulators and research ethics committees (ERCs). While several projects in East Africa have supported ERC capacity building, the extent remains uneven and often depends on short, in-person trainings that are difficult to scale or sustain.
The Good Research Regulatory Practice (GRRP) course was developed under consortium for Clinical Trials Regulation and Ethics Capacity Development in Uganda and offered to regional partners. The course proved useful, yet demand exceeded capacity for face-to-face delivery. In 2023, with support from the European Union under strengthening ethics and responsible conduct of clinical trials in east and sub-Saharan Africa (SERCEA) collaboration, development of GRRP e-learning platform targeting ERCs and national regulators was initiated. The goal was to provide accessible, country-relevant, and regularly updated training that reviewers complete at their own pace.
Through SERCEA, the curriculum, content was reviewed and updated to reflect current international and regional guidance. Each country team then adapted materials to its national regulatory context (terminology, required documents, submission pathways, and review standards). The platform was built on Moodle to allow modular courses, simple navigation, discussion forums, graded quizzes, and printable certificates. Country administrators have rights to update content as policies evolve providing a mechanism for continuous professional development.
User testing is planned with reviewers and regulators to assess clarity, relevance, and usability. Feedback on case studies, assessment difficulty, navigation, and time burden will inform revisions before roll-out. We expect the platform to: (1) improve baseline knowledge and decision consistency among reviewers; (2) reduce time and cost barriers associated with in-person training; and (3) provide sustainable mechanism as regulatory landscape changes. Ultimately, the e learning platform offers a practical way for new and experienced reviewers across countries to strengthen review quality and protect research participants in a rapidly expanding research environment.

Open Science to Increase Reproducibility in Science: The OSIRIS Project

Dr. Inge Stegeman[1], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[2], *Dr. Florian Naudet*[3], *Dr Veerle van den Eynden*[4], *Dr. Hynek Roubik*[5], *Mónika Varga*[6], *Rita Banzi*[7], *Ms. Ayu Putu Madri Dewi*[2], *Drs Stefan Wouters*[1], *Constant Vinatier*[3], *Dr. Nicholas de Vito*[8]

[1]*UMC Utrecht, Netherlands,* [2]*Amsterdam UMC, the Netherlands,* [3]*INSERM, France,* [4]*KU Leuven, Belgium,* [5]*Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Czech Republic,* [6]*Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Hungary,* [7]*Mario Negri Institute, Italy,* [8]*University of Oxford, United Kingdom*

OSIRIS is one of three multinational EU-funded consortia, alongside iRise and TIER2, examining how reproducibility can be improved throughout research and innovation. We investigated underlying drivers of reproducibility, are testing interventions, and have identified barriers and facilitators, to embed reproducibility enhancing practices, based in open science, into the research process.

A scoping review with TIER2 found a lack of high-quality evidence for the benefits and harms of reproducibility-enhancing interventions in the literature. An audit of research institutes, funders and journals, relevant to European science showed little focus on promoting, rewarding or supporting open science. Interviews with European researchers revealed many obstacles for reproducible work, resulting from the academic ecosystem, research culture, practical constraints, and the way research itself is done. Motivation towards reproducible research comes from community values, the visibility of research and reputation as a good scientist. Reproducibility practices often depend on enabling conditions whereby disciplinary diversity matters.

The most mature of our randomised controlled trials tests the use of an open science checklist during peer review at two biomedical journals. Preliminary findings suggest an effect on data and code availability while overall computational reproducibility remains low. A comprehensive open science checklist to promote rigor and transparency-enhancing practices to researchers was developed through a Delphi process. A key finding during development was that although some core items are common to various fields, their applicability and implementation differs across disciplines. Efforts towards automated monitoring of uptake of open science practices reveal the shortcomings of current tools and the insufficient availability of metadata for monitoring at scale.

This presentation will summarise these, and other, OSIRIS activities and synthesise findings into key learnings on how reproducibility applies across disciplines, what interventions show promise for enhancing reproducibility, and how this informs policy and practice across institutions.

OSIRIS is funded by the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101094725. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency (ERA).

Disciplinary Differences Matter

Prof. Mads Sørensen[1], *Tine Ravn*[1], *Jens Peter Andersen*[1], *Dr. Lise Degn*[3], *Dr. Serge Horbach*[2], *Dr. Rachel Fishberg*[1], *Dr. Ebbe Krogh Graversen*[1], *Dr. Evanthia K. Schmidt*[1], *Prof. Jesper Schneider*[1]
[1]*Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark,* [2]*Radboud Univerity, Nijmegen, The Netherlands,* [3]*Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark*

This presentation focuses on how disciplinary differences in research integrity perceptions and practices can be studied empirically. While research integrity is often treated as a universal set of principles, its interpretation and implementation vary significantly across academic fields due to differing methodological approaches and epistemological foundations. These differences affect how responsible research conduct is understood and how questionable research practices (QRPs) are recognized and assessed.

The presentation argues that to advance research integrity scholarship—as well as guidelines and training activities—we must develop approaches that are sensitive to disciplinary contexts. It offers practical advice on how such differences can be investigated empirically, drawing on two studies as illustrative examples.

The first study, Ravn & Sørensen (2021), examines how QRPs manifest differently across research areas. It shows that many QRPs are closely tied to specific disciplinary practices, and that practices deemed questionable in one field may be considered acceptable—or even exemplary—in another. This underscores the need for nuanced, context-aware approaches to research integrity studies.

The second study, Andersen et al. (2025), examines the use of generative AI (GenAI) in research and shows that researchers from different disciplines differ markedly in what they consider responsible conduct when integrating GenAI into research processes. These variations highlight the risk of ethical and practical misalignment if generic policies are applied. Accordingly, the study emphasizes the need for discipline-sensitive guidelines for GenAI use, developed collaboratively with domain experts to reflect diverse research practices.

In both cases, disciplinary differences were examined by dividing research into five main areas: Natural Sciences, Technical Sciences, Medical Sciences (including Biomedicine), Social Sciences, and the Humanities. Each main area was further divided into sub-fields, such as experimental/laboratory and theoretical research in the natural and technical sciences, and qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences. This structured approach enabled systematic comparisons across diverse epistemic cultures and methodological traditions.

The presentation concludes by proposing strategies for designing empirical studies that capture epistemic and methodological differences and for balancing discipline-specific needs with overarching integrity principles—contributing to more inclusive and context-sensitive research integrity research and frameworks.

The More You Automate, the Less You See: Hidden Pitfalls of AI Scientist Systems

*Ziming Luo, Prof. Atoosa Kasirzadeh, **Prof. Nihar Shah**[1]*
[1]Carnegie Mellon University, USA

Objective
Autonomous AI scientist systems—capable of conducting end-to-end research—have rapidly gained significant prominence. As their role expands, it is vital to understand whether their research practices align with principles of research integrity. We empirically examine key integrity risks inherent in such systems and propose interventions to ensure integrity of AI-generated research.

Methods
To rigorously evaluate integrity risks while eliminating various possible confounders, we design a novel task that is outside the corpus of the internet. We construct controlled experimental protocols to isolate four potential failure modes: inappropriate benchmark selection, data leakage, metric misuse, and post-hoc selection bias. We evaluate two representative AI scientist systems, Agent Laboratory and The AI Scientist v2, to assess the presence and severity of these risks.

Results
We find that AI scientist systems exhibit multiple pitfalls violating research integrity.

1) Benchmark selection: AI Scientist v2 prefers benchmarks with strong pre-existing results; Agent Laboratory biases toward datasets it encounters first.

2) Data leakage: Neither system uses restricted "test" data. However, importantly, both systems occasionally generate their own datasets without disclosure, which significantly and falsely inflate their results.

3) Metric misuse: We do not observe cherry-picking of metrics.

4) Post-hoc selection bias: Their internal mechanisms p-hack results by conducting multiple experiments and selective reporting only the most favorable one.

Our Proposed Detection Method: To detect these pitfalls, we build an LLM-based auditing method. Recall that journals and conferences today primarily evaluate the final paper. We find that using only the final paper, the accuracy of detection of these pitfalls is near chance (accuracy = 51%, F1=0.48). When provided with additional trace logs and code, detection dramatically improves (accuracy=74%, F1=0.75).

Conclusion
AI scientists promise to accelerate discovery, but their integrity risks demand oversight that goes beyond traditional frameworks. Based on our findings, we recommend that journals and conferences adapt their policies for submissions of AI-generated research by requiring full workflow trace logs and complete code submissions, and by actively auditing these materials. Limitations: our analysis examined four key integrity pitfalls across two leading AI scientist systems; future work should extend this to encompass additional risks and emerging models.

Ethical Challenges in an Observational Study with Adolescents in Bangladesh: Researchers' Reflexive Insights on Participant Wellbeing, Integrity, and Responsibility

Dr. Farah Naz Rahman[1,2], *Iffat Sharmin*[1], *Dr Anadil Alam*[1]
[1]*International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research Bangladesh (icddr,b), Bangladesh,* [2]*Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Australia*

Objective
In observational studies, particularly in low and middle income country settings, ethical dimensions of participant and researcher well being are often under addressed. Empirical guidance on how research teams should respond to participant deaths during cohorts is limited. We present a researcher reflexivity analysis from a cohort-study in rural Bangladesh to delineate ethical challenges arising from participant deaths and to propose practice oriented recommendations that advance research integrity.

Methods
A cohort of 2,713 adolescents aged 12 to 16 years was followed at 4-month intervals to assess sexual and reproductive health and related well-being outcomes. During follow-up, six adolescents died, four by suicide, one from road-traffic injury, and one from pregnancy-related complications. We undertook a structured reflexive-exercise comprising facilitated debriefs with field and core teams, rapid review of incident-logs and field-notes, and reflexive-memos. Analysis was guided by Ethics by Design, Narrative Ethics, and trauma informed research practices. Credibility was enhanced through investigator triangulation and an audit trail.

Results
Critical reflection showed that the protocol contained only passive advice for referral when self harm intention was reported, and no active safeguarding was initiated for households or field-staff after the suicides or injury-related deaths. Deaths were recorded and reported as lost-to-follow-up in scientific outputs. Three analytic themes emerged. First, Ethics by Design identified gaps in risk anticipation, stakeholder-inclusion, and iterative protocol-adaptation that impeded timely response; recommendations included tiered crisis referral-algorithms with clear activation triggers, consented household follow up, and community-sensitization that does not alter study outcomes. Second, trauma-informed practices identified moral distress, secondary trauma, and unclear duty of care boundaries among field teams; recommendations included scheduled critical incident debriefs, access to psychosocial support, escalation trees, and routine reflexive documentation to inform adaptive oversight. Third, Narrative Ethics identified collapsing deaths into attrition-categories caused ethical harm; recommendations included dignified and accurate mortality reporting, contextual notes where appropriate, and governance for sensitive dissemination that preserves confidentiality while recognizing persons beyond numbers.

Conclusion
Research integrity must extend beyond data-collection to encompass the well-being of participants and researchers. Embedding minimal safeguarding mechanisms, community-engagement, reflexive-support for field-teams, and ethically respectful reporting practices are essential, even in observational studies.

Generative AI in Research and Data Integrity

Dr. Louisa Savereide[1]
[1]*Maidstone Consulting Group, Boston, MA, USA, Oristano Italy EU, USA*

Generative AI in Research and Data Integrity
Louisa Savereide, Mitchell Farrell, Mary C. Walsh, and Corinna Raimondo
Maidstone Consulting Group, LLC, Boston MA USA, Oristano Italy EU

AI tools are changing the way scientific research is performed, from assisting in planning and designing experimentation to producing text and image data that are integrated into research workflows and reported outcomes.

Whether AI is a tool in the scientist's arsenal or not, an accessible and traceable data lifecycle is an essential element of confidence in data validity and experimental reproducibility for research reported in papers, presentations, and other scholarly works.

In a rapidly evolving landscape of AI-assisted or generated content, there are knowledge gaps in "do" and "don't" scenarios throughout the research data lifecycle concerning practice and product. We will review frameworks for evaluating research and data integrity workflows, including how to leverage constellations of data features and hallmarks related to experimental output at various stages of the data lifecycle. We will consider ways in which AI tools may be used and provide decision makers points for reflection regarding AI usage in the context of data and research integrity.

Topics for discussion will include: establishing working definitions of the data lifecycle, and 'raw' and 'source' data as it applies to research and data integrity workflows, what is meant by the terms 'AI' and 'AI tools' in this context, and review of current and anticipated mandates and guidance for recording and reporting research data, and AI-associated outcomes.

Relationality, Complexity and Situational Ethics in Conducting Research in Rural Settings of South Africa

Dr. Thembeka Sdinane[1]
[1]*Nelson Mandela University, Gqeberha, South Africa*

Conducting research in contexts with limited research exposure is complex; transparency and honesty are crucial to ensure that research participants understand what is required of them and gain trust in the research process itself. In the African context, especially in rural areas, where ways of being and doing are underpinned by indigenous systems that may not always be aligned with the current epistemological practices, it is important that the application of research conduct guidelines, such as ethical and integrity principles, is situated within the context in which they are being applied. In this paper, I reflect on conducting research in rural communities. Particularly, I focus on the recruitment, data collection and analysis phases. I position these reflections on three epistemic dispositions. Firstly, I reflect on the importance of relationality in the context of research in rural communities. Particularly, reflecting on how this disposition is crucial in recruitment and data collection. Secondly, I reflect on embracing complexity in researching rural communities and transparency in addressing that complexity. In this disposition, I highlight the complexity of conducting research in areas with limited to no research exposure, and the importance of respecting the ways of being and doing in rural contexts while adhering to universal and context-specific ethical standards. Lastly, I reflect on how the application of the situational ethics framework may assist researchers conducting studies in rural contexts. I provide examples of my experiences from my PhD journey, my positionality, as well as how I navigated these dispositions.

Ethical Implications of AI Integration in Research Assessment

Dr. Susanne van den Hooff[1], *Dr. Matt Coler*[2]
[1]*University Of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands,* [2]*University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands*

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into research assessment practices represents a shift in how scientific work is evaluated, from conventional research metrics, such as citation counts or journal impact factors to the use of AI-assisted tools. While AI-assisted tools promise enhanced efficiency, consistency, and scale in research evaluation, their deployment raises critical questions about fairness, transparency, and the preservation of research integrity.
This presentation addresses ethical implications of AI integration in research assessment practices. We conducted a targeted literature review of sources curated by the CoARA-ERIP working group to examine ethical challenges and opportunities. The research question was: What are the key ethical considerations, gaps, and opportunities identified in the literature regarding the effects of the adoption of AI tools on research assessment?
We identified several ethical concerns, needs, and gaps which all present challenges. These challenges point towards opportunities for developing responsible AI-assisted research assessment. For example, the fragmented landscape highlights the need for coordinated efforts to develop shared standards and best practices across institutions (coordination opportunities); the predominance of theoretical work over empirical studies is an opportunity for systematic pilot implementations and collaborative case study collections to build the evidence base the field urgently needs (evidence-building opportunity); the disconnect between principles and practice opens possibilities for creating practical assessment tools, checklists, and implementation guides that translate ethical considerations into actionable steps (tool development opportunity); and last but not least, low completion rates for traditional ethical training courses suggest the need for innovative training approaches (training innovation opportunities).
Our findings reveal a research assessment landscape in transition, where rapid technological advancement has outpaced our capacity to evaluate and govern it effectively. While ethical concerns are well-articulated and policy frameworks are emerging, the critical middle layer—practical implementation tools, empirical evidence, and coordination mechanisms—remains underdeveloped. Research institutions can address this gap by establishing cross-institutional working groups to develop shared standards for AI tool evaluation, creating pilot programs to test responsible AI integration, and building capacity through targeted training for assessment professionals. These coordinated efforts provide a promising path toward closing the implementation gap in responsible AI-assisted research assessment.

Bridging Gaps in Research Integrity Capacity: A Train-the-Trainers Model from Thailand

Mrs. Namol Vorapreeda[1], *Dr. De Ming Chau*[2], *Mrs. Supapon Cheevadhanarak*[1,3,5], *Mr. Bundit Fungtammasan*[4], *Mr Keerati Pinijsattawong*[1]
[1]*Research, Innovation and Partnerships Office, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), Bangkok, Thailand,* [2]*Department of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, -, Malaysia,* [3]*School of Bioresources and Technology, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), Bangkok, Thailand,* [4]*The Joint Graduate School of Energy and Environment (JGSEE), King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), Bangkok, Thailand,* [5]*Pilot Plant Development and Training Institute, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), Bangkok, Thailand*

Promoting research integrity (RI) requires not only policies and compliance, but also sustainable institutional capacity development. In Thailand, smaller and emerging universities often face systemic challenges, including limited access to tailored training, lack of qualified facilitators, and reliance on centralized programs that may not meet local or disciplinary needs.
To address these shortcomings, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), in collaboration with an expert from Malaysia, developed and implemented a Train-the-Trainers (ToT) workshop model based on the Malaysian Educational Module on Responsible Conduct of Research. The program combined RI principles with participatory facilitation and active learning techniques, such as case-based exercises, role playing, problem solving, and facilitated discussion, to equip faculty and researchers to serve as institutional trainers.
Two rounds of workshops were conducted: the first for KMUTT faculty, and the second for external participants (including the private sector) with the support of the National Research Council of Thailand (NRCT), which has the key role in promoting RI and its governance in the country. The first cohort was selected based on their interest and motivation in RI; high-potential participants were later nominated as co-facilitators for the second workshop.
Together, these sessions trained over 60 facilitators. Participants strengthened their understanding of Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) and global and institutional initiatives in RI promotion, explored emerging RI issues such as the ethical use of AI, and co-developed a draft core RCR module for graduate programs. The initiative also fostered collaboration through the Thailand Research Integrity Network (TH-RIN), encouraging peer learning, mentorship, and cross-institutional engagement.
The ToT model provides a scalable, context-relevant framework for strengthening RI capacity in Thailand. By decentralizing training and empowering institutions, including the private sector, to lead their own initiatives, inclusivity, local ownership, and long-term sustainability are promoted. The experience highlights the value of open-minded, engaging facilitators who deploy diverse, interactive learning tools. For countries lacking such expertise, regional cooperation can offer a practical solution, as amply demonstrated in this case. The Thai model, recognized by KMUTT and NRCT administrators, offers valuable lessons for adapting similar approaches in other national and regional contexts.

Successes and Challenges Enforcing Human Research Ethics Policies in Global Research

Dr. Maria Zalm[1], *Dr. Renee Hoch*[1], *Dr. Emily Chenette*[1]
[1]*PLOS, San Francisco, USA*

In 2021, PLOS was notified of research ethics concerns affecting hundreds of publications, including >100 PLOS articles, linked to the same research institute. Many of the concerning articles reported global research in which human samples were collected outside the authors' home country/ies and for which there were ethics approval concerns. Editorial assessment of the issues proved difficult; identifying and engaging independent officials in the affected regions, finding relevant policies for different locations at the time the studies took place, and receiving contradicting information being common stumbling blocks. Due to the scope and complexity of the case PLOS One issued interim EOCs on 49 of the highest concern articles; five years after the initial concerns were raised, investigations are complete for 17/49 articles with interim EOCs and editorial investigations for the remaining articles are still ongoing.

In parallel to this post-publication work, PLOS One staff editors conducted a pilot study in 2022 to assess compliance of incoming submissions with PLOS policies on research involving human participants. The study, involving submissions to PLOS One and PLOS Global Public Health by authors affiliated with institutions in three countries from different continents, indicated that screening ethics approval documentation could significantly reduce the risk of publishing unethical research. These findings supported the decision to introduce a policy for several PLOS journals, including PLOS One, requiring submissions reporting research involving human participants, or their biospecimens or data, to include the original ethics approval document(s). Ethics documents are carefully assessed before peer review.

Implementation of this policy in March 2023 resulted in a significant increase of manuscript rejections from every continent, suggesting that research involving human subjects without appropriate, prospective ethics approval is more prevalent than previously anticipated and is not a geographically restricted issue.

This presentation will discuss the approaches taken and difficulties encountered whilst trying to address post-publication global research ethics concerns at scale, and our success with the editorial policy change that is helping PLOS prevent publication of articles with ethics approval concerns going forward. We call for improved collaboration between institutions, governmental officials, and journals in investigating and addressing research ethics concerns.

Relationship Between Retraction and Mentorship

Ms. Kathryn Weber-Boer[1], *Dr. Carlos Areia*[1], *Dr. Leslie Mcintosh*[1]
[1]*Digital Science, London, UK*

Objective
Mentorship is an important feature in the social production of knowledge, and inadequate mentorship can lead to a failure of knowledge transfer leading to sloppy research or, in a worst-case scenario, malignant mentorship can lead to breaches in integrity. In this paper we test the hypothesis that there is a relationship between mentor and mentee malpractice, and explore the direction of this relationship.

Methods
In this paper we use a validated algorithmic approach to identifying mentor-mentee relationships, based on co-authorship, grant relationships, and seniority (among other elements), to test the relationship between a positive mentorship relationships and integrity issues resulting in publication retractions or involvement in problematic publication networks (such as papermills). We use the strength (calculated through the algorithm) and directionality of both the mentor relationship and the malpractice.

Results
We have prepared a dataset of all mentorship pairs, in which 1,172,517 pairs (combining 154,539 mentors and 566,681 mentees) had retracted publications, and calculated their rates of retractions before, during, and after the mentoring relationship (the rate being the number of retracted publications relative to the total number of publications). Initial results show a positive correlation between the retraction rates of mentors and mentees when they have published alone, both before and after mentorship; the Pearson correlation is stronger after mentorship (0.22) than before (0.18). To explore some of the reasons for this correlation, we explore a case study of some known actors in an apparent authorship-for-sale network. We also consider the reasons for retraction, in addition to the incidence of retraction.

Conclusion
Our results suggest that the mentorship relationship is related to the spread of problematic research practices. This knowledge can be used both to suggest the careful review of mentors and mentees of researchers found to engage in these practices, but also indicates the importance of intervention, not only in punitive measures against researchers found to engage in malpractice, but in preventative measures with their closest collaborators.

Effects of Publications Containing Image Duplication and Manipulation on Preclinical Evidence Syntheses

Dr. Kimberley Wever[1], *Ms Jolina Janssen*[1], *Ms Emma Valgimigli*[1], *Dr. Rene Aquarius*[1]
[1]*Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, Netherlands*

Objective
Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of animal studies are essential for evaluating the translational potential of biomedical interventions. However, their reliability is threatened by the recent rise in publications containing inappropriately duplicated or manipulated scientific images. We investigated the prevalence of publications containing such problematic images, assess whether they could be identified by their study design, risk of bias or effect size, and determine their effect on meta-analysis. As our case study, we updated a 2017 systematic review on metformin in preclinical models of myocardial infarction.

Methods
Following the 2017 review's protocol, we included studies using in-vivo or ex-vivo myocardial ischemia models, assessing the effect of metformin treatment versus control on myocardial infarct size and cardiac function. Study characteristics were extracted and risk of bias was assessed using SYRCLE's risk of bias tool. Included publications were screened using ImageTwin, an AI-based tool to detect image duplication and manipulation. Meta-analyses were conducted with and without publications containing problematic images.

Results
The updated review included 75 publications, of which 34 (45%) contained problematic images. In the 2017 review, the prevalence of problematic images was 26% (7/26 publications). Fifty-six percent of the publications containing problematic images had a corresponding author affiliated to a Chinese institute. Publications with problematic images could not be distinguished from non-flagged publications based on their study design or characteristics, risk of bias, journal, publisher, or the reported effect size, making it very difficult to detect potentially unreliable data. Removing studies with problematic images from the updated review reduced the number of studies in meta-analyses by 40 to 53%, depending on the outcome measure. Pooled effect sizes remained largely unchanged.

Conclusion
Publications containing problematic images are widespread in this body of preclinical research. There is a high risk of such studies going unnoticed in evidence syntheses due to their indistinguishability in study characteristics, risk of bias and effect sized reported. This threatens the reliability of preclinical evidence syntheses and the translation of preclinical finding to clinical practice. Incorporating tools to assess research integrity, such as image screening, is critical to ensure the trustworthiness of preclinical systematic reviews.

7.E - Oral Session

May 6, 2026, 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM

Reflexivity and Responsibility: Upholding Research Integrity in Online Studies of Gendered Violence

Ms. Heidi Lamb[1]
[1]*University Of Manitoba, Canada*

Objective
This presentation will address the challenges of upholding research integrity (RI) when studying gendered violence. Based on my PhD research examining gender-based sexual violence (GBSV) and digital misogyny, I will speak to ethical challenges of participant protection, maintaining methodological integrity in mixed-methods designs, and ensuring researcher well-being when studying sensitive topics.

Method
My study will use a mixed-methods approach, including surveys and interviews with Canadian post-secondary students and a netnographic content analysis. I will reflect on RI in digital environments, such as obtaining informed consent through social media recruitment, mitigating re-traumatization for participants and myself, and ensuring small datasets are anonymized.

Results
to my ethics application are currently under review and I expect to start conducting research in November 2025. I am currently working through ethical tensions between participant safety and research validity by planning to implement trauma-informed protocols to prevent harm without sugarcoating digital misogyny and GBSV. By WCRI 2026, I will be finished with data collection and analysis so I can share insights of how I upheld RI during the study. I will outline how I managed vicarious trauma and how I enabled reflexivity while researching these topics. I will advocate for researcher well-being to be a crucial aspect of the research process to maintain RI when engaging with harmful online content or sensitive topics such as GBSV. Finally, I will share the data management plan I developed to manage sensitive data collected online in order to maintain users' confidentiality. I hope to share lessons I learned from the research process to maintain RI in digital environments and to spark cross-disciplinary conversations about protecting participants and researchers in studies of gendered violence. Finally, I hope to add my voice to the expanding field of social media research, where ethical and methodological boundaries are being continuously re-negotiated.

Conclusion
This presentation will contribute to conversations about upholding RI in studies about gendered violence, both on and offline, while also advocating for the well-being of participants and researchers alike. Potential limitations include self-selection bias related to the participants, and reactivity associated with the self-reported data.

From Research Security to Responsible Governance: Reframing Accountability in Research and Development

*Dr. Jeehyun Suh[1], **Dr. Sora Kim**[1]*
[1]Korea Institute of Science & Technology Evaluation and Planning (KISTEP)), Eumseong-gun, South Korea

This paper examines how research security is integrated into the framework of responsible research governance through the case of recent advancement of research security policy for the government funded research in South Korea. It aims to address how research security can be integrated into responsible governance that balance national security, research integrity and academic autonomy. The study employs a qualitative analysis of Korea's national R&D security policy framework and institutional review, combining the use of documents and case studies of research institutions. The document review of legal statues related to the National R&D, and policy reports have been supplemented with interviews and meeting minutes that involve policy makers, staffs in research institutions and funding agencies as well as researchers.
Preliminary findings reveal that current research security policies emphasize compliance and administrative control, resulting in unclear responsibility boundaries and excessive accountability burden of researchers. While governments establish legal oversight, it often fails to specify how responsibility is shared or coordinated. Policy compliance tends to dominate over reflexive learning as the roles are concentrated on building administrative accountability. There is still a significant gap between the regulatory framework for research security and the systems implemented within research institutions, and the actual perceptions of research security among researchers. The legal mandates are often only symbolically implemented lacking concrete implementation plans and guidelines. Awareness of security risks at the level of research institutions and researchers remains low. The institutional roles for research security have not yet been effectively coordinated creating fragmented responsibilities.
This paper argues that the sustainability of research security depends not on tighter regulation but on a shift toward responsible governance grounded in distributed accountability involving a dynamic coordination in which responsibility is shared, negotiated and reconfigured. Accountability needs to be reframed from a hierarchical delegation of duties to a dynamic coordination of shared responsibilities. This reframing offers a pathway from "research security" as protectionist control towards "responsible governance" as collaborative stewardship of scientific integrity and societal trust.

Research Integrity and Ethics in Studies Involving Indigenous Peoples and National Minorities in Norway: Lessons from Cases on Human Remains

Dr. Lene Os Johannessen[1]
[1]*National Research Ethics Committees, Norway*

In Norway, the Sámi are recognized as an Indigenous people, and several groups have the status of national minorities. For a long time, both faced marginalization, assimilation, and discrimination. Historically, research objectified these groups and disregarded their consent and cultural values, fostering deep mistrust toward research and researchers among many members of the groups.

Restoring trust in research involving Indigenous peoples and national minorities requires a strong foundation in research integrity (RI) and research ethics (RE). At the same time, it requires that the RI and RE framework and discourse take into account the Indigenous and national minorities' ways of being and doing.

The National Research Ethics Committees in Norway (NREC) aims at ensuring that all research in Norway takes place in accordance with recognized standards and norms of RI and RE, and a focus is to develop guidelines. Notably, NREC's National Committee for Research Ethics on Human Remains has developed guidance on and has handled several cases involving human remains of individuals from Indigenous and national minority groups.

Building on cases, the aim for this presentation is to discuss the relation between RI/RE and the perspectives and knowledge systems of Indigenous peoples and national minorities in Norway, with a particular focus on research on human remains. Further, the aim is to discuss in what ways research involving these communities necessitates specific RI/RE frameworks, guidelines or systems.

The Role of Trust and Integrity in the Sharing of Human Biological Samples in Collaborative Research: Kenyan Researchers' Perspectives

Mr. Timothy Kiplagat[1], *Mr. Enock Kebenei*[1], *Mr Gideon Cornel Msee*[1]
[1]*Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya*

Background
Collaborative research often involves sharing of samples for analysis; however, issues of loss of control and potential misuse remain a major concern in North-South research collaborations. Openness and integrity influence the willingness of researchers to share samples. This study explored ethical considerations for export of human biological samples in Kenya.

Methods
We adopted mixed methods for the whole study, but here we report findings based on qualitative data. We conducted 9 Key Informant Interviews with purposively selected researchers who frequently exported samples. The data was analyzed thematically using NVivo 12.

Results
The lack of adequate in-country capacity for analysis and the need for standardization of analysis were reported as the main drivers for the export of samples overseas. Although Kenyan researchers raised concerns of loss of control over exported samples, trust and perceived integrity among collaborating partners influenced their willingness to share samples even in the absence of physical oversight. Respondents shared that Material Transfer Agreements between global north and south collaborating institutions were crucial in outlining the frameworks of sample ownership, sharing, and intellectual property rights; however, the respondents emphasized that MTAs were not sufficient, but the established trust and integrity of their collaborating partners mattered too. Despite trust and integrity being some key aspects that influence Kenyan researchers to share samples with their collaborators, some researchers indicated that concerns of transparency in sample use of exported samples and possible sharing of data with third parties need to be addressed through institutional mechanisms. To guarantee compliance with the agreements, the respondents suggested the need for adequate measures and procedures that will ensure sample originators can verify if the samples are used and handled in accordance with the obligations of agreements signed in collaborative research.

Conclusion
The findings highlight the importance of trustworthiness and integrity in sharing of human biological samples in collaborative research. Integrity in the use of human samples needs to be enhanced through institutional mechanisms that allow monitoring of use of exported samples and capacity strengthening to allow local analysis of research samples.

Bridging the Digital Divide: Ethical AI Adoption and Research Integrity in Resource-Constrained Educational Institutions

Dr. Kelebogile Kenalemang[1]
[1]*Botswana Accountancy College, Botswana*

This paper examines how unequal access to Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies influences research integrity and ethical academic practice in developing higher education contexts. It proposes a contextual framework for equitable and responsible AI adoption, using Botswana Accountancy College (BAC) as a case study representing resource-constrained yet innovation-driven institutions in the Global South.

AI has the potential to transform teaching, learning, and research through data analytics, plagiarism detection, and automated academic support. However, in many African institutions, integration is hindered by infrastructural, financial, and policy constraints. Challenges at BAC, including limited institutional AI guidelines, dependence on commercial software, high bandwidth costs, and uneven staff capacity, mirror broader regional realities. These constraints create risks around data privacy, authorship ethics, and the quality of AI-assisted research outputs. While global AI governance frameworks emphasize compliance, they rarely address the contextual inequities shaping how institutions in low and middle-income countries adopt and monitor AI responsibly.

This practice-based inquiry draws on institutional observations, programme-level experiences, and stakeholder consultations within BAC's data analytics and business education programs. The case study highlights internal initiatives such as the integration of AI ethics in the curriculum, student mentorship under the Adopt-a-Mentee programme, and emerging faculty digital literacy efforts. These institutional experiences illustrate both the opportunities and vulnerabilities of AI adoption in resource-constrained contexts and inform the development of a localized framework for responsible integration.

Findings reveal three interrelated priorities for enhancing ethical AI adoption: building institutional capacity through literacy and training, embedding AI-use policies within research and integrity protocols, and fostering regional collaboration to promote open-access tools and shared digital infrastructure. The study concludes that ethical AI adoption in developing educational systems must go beyond access, it requires equitable, transparent, and context-sensitive ecosystems. The BAC case demonstrates how leadership, mentorship, and governance reforms can transform AI challenges into opportunities for inclusion and innovation, ensuring that technological advancement strengthens rather than undermines research integrity in the Global South.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Research Integrity, Digital Divide, Higher Education, Ethical Adoption, Global South

SHARE Principles: A Timely Proposed Interdisciplinary Framework of Responsible Research and Research Integrity

Prof. Navin Kumar Verma[1,2], *Dr. Willie Koh*[2], *Ms. Su Nee Goh*[3], *Celine Lee*[1]

[1]Good Research Practice Office, Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University Singapore, Singapore, [2]Research Integrity and Ethics Office, Nanyang Technological University Singapore, Singapore, [3]Library, Nanyang Technological University Singapore, Singapore

In today's dynamically evolving data-intensive environment, fostering a culture of responsible research conduct requires a proactive shift rooted in training, supervision, mentorship, and shared values. To support this shift, Good Research Practice Office at Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University Singapore, has developed the "SHARE Principles" - a practical framework to embed ethical conduct at the heart of research practice, while reinforcing research integrity and ethics education. This framework introduces a robust ethics infrastructure, grounded in five interlocking principles. First, Safeguarding data through proper management, confidentiality, and reproducibility. Second, Harmonizing research practices with existing policies and standards to enhance collaboration and reduce conflicts. Third, Accelerating responsible innovation via open science, promoting transparency while maintaining ethical boundaries. Fourth, Reinforcing research integrity through adherence to best practices, accountability measures, and robust reporting. Fifth, Educating research communities through mentorship and training that go beyond technical skills to nurture ethical awareness across cultures and disciplines. This framework reimagines Good Research Practices from merely meeting compliance obligations to actively inculcating responsible conduct of research through targeted mentorship and training and provides a unified foundation. Our pilot survey findings show that SHARE Principles can be adopted by broader interdisciplinary research communities, serving as a harmonized model for research integrity education globally. By encouraging researchers to act as stewards of ethical responsibility, SHARE Principles offer a transformative framework for sustainable, integrity-driven scientific advancement. In this presentation, we will share our SHARE Principles and key insights gained through their development and potential implementation in the academic settings.

Tailoring to Diversity - Mapping Disciplinary Perspectives on Responsible Conduct of Research Using a Delphi Study

Mr. Tom Van Drimmelen[1,2,3], Dr Jackie Thompson[8,9], Dr. Jenn Ferrar[8], Dr. Sarahanne Field[10], Prof. Dr. Bart Penders[6,7], Prof. Dr. Sarah De Rijcke[3,4], Prof. Dr. Marcus Munafò[5], ***Dr. Jackie Thompson***
[1]Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands, [2]Metascience Alliance, [3]Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS), Leiden, The Netherlands, [4]Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands, [5]University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom, [6]RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany, [7]Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands, [8]Bristol University, Bristol, United Kingdom, [9]Oxford University, Oxford, United Kingdom, [10]University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

Objective
Very few things in life are one-size-fits-all, and findings from our Delphi study indicate that Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) is no exception. While a broad “core” of RCR dimensions commands wide agreement, many others were judged conditional or contested. Saying that training must be tailored to audiences is easy; the real challenge is to see where tailoring is necessary, and to offer guidance on how it should be approached. Building on our Delphi study of 38 dimensions of RCR, this companion work turns from general patterns to dimension-by-dimension analyses, aiming to support educators, policy-makers, and researchers in tailoring RCR practices to their contexts.

Methods
We are currently finishing our analysis of all qualitative input from a panel of ~50 RCR experts from various disciplines across three Delphi rounds. Participants rated the importance of each dimension, reviewed feedback reports, and provided written explanations. For each dimension, we systematically summarised the panellists’ arguments in favour and against its importance, as well as any of their contextual notes regarding conditional importance or practical notes for implementation.

Results
The outcome is a series of one-page synopses, one for each of the 38 dimensions, representing the collaborative reasoning of the expert Delphi panel. These synopses document not only consensus views but also points of dissent, conditional relevance, and disciplinary or epistemological caveats. For example, “Reproducibility/replicability/repeatability” showed deep epistemic divides, while dimensions like “Data sharing” or “Ethical treatment of participants” were often judged inapplicable in some fields but defended as more broadly relevant by others. Together, these synopses provide a structured map of where consensus exists, where dissent persists, and how these differences may inform practice.

Conclusion
This collection of synopses provides a practical resource for tailoring RCR training and policy. Instead of prescribing a universal checklist, it offers concrete insight into where disciplinary tailoring may be needed, what kinds of arguments arise around each dimension, and what contextual implementation might look. By making these analyses openly available, we hope to support others in adapting RCR frameworks more sensitively to their audiences, and invite the community to explore, apply, and refine these resources.

AI-Enabled Systematic Review Platforms: How Well Do They Perform?

Dr. Charis Wong[1], *Harris Khalid*[2], *Katarzyna Stefanska*[2], *Florence Do*[2], *Mohammed Abomostafa*[2], *Gemma Dalgety*[2], *Prof. Malcolm Macleod*[1]
[1]*Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom,* [2]*Edinburgh Medical School, Edinburgh, United Kingdom*

Objective
Traditional systematic reviews are time and resource intensive, limiting their application. There has been a recent emergence of AI-enabled systematic review platforms promising faster and more comprehensive reviews. However, independent validation of these platforms is needed to assess their suitability and potential to augment or replace human reviewer efforts.

Methods
We evaluated the performance of three platforms – Elicit.AI, Nested Knowledge and Scispace – across different systematic review stages. We seek to replicate three recently published systematic reviewsand compare the performance of each platform against original published findings. We pre-registered our protocol on OSF (doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/8NF6H).

Results
As of October 2025, we completed citation screening across all platforms for the first review (https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.21302.1). The platforms vary in usage and reporting of AI methods, degrees of automation and required human supervision, transparency, customisability, and data sources. Retrieval limits were 500 studies per review for Elicit and 10000 for Nested Knowledge.

Elicit.AI uses LLMs to screen citations against criteria defined by users. Nested Knowledge offers greater customisation but requires more human input and oversight. Of the 15 studies included in the original review, Elicit and Scispace both included 6 studies (sensitivity 40%). We identified all 15 studies using Nested Knowledge with a dual-pass, dual-reviewer set up; we enabled their AI-based Robot Screener for abstract screening after 477 human dual-screened decisions (11 advanced) on the corpus of 1889 citations. Robot Screener yielded a sensitivity of 72.7% and precision of 42.1%.

We terminated our evaluation of Scispace on the basis of futility. The data files and systematic review report exported were corrupted hindering evaluation. Scispace reported retrieving 121 studies, 65 of which unique, but there were five duplicate citations within that set.

Conclusion
Preliminary findings highlight significant variability in the performance of AI-enabled systematic review platforms. Low sensitivity and technical limitations in some platforms may compromise reliability. Further analyses of later review stages and replication of two additional systematic reviews using Elicit.AI and Nested Knowledge are underway.

Pickpockets, Murderers, or Even the Wrongly Accused: How Many and What Type of Questionable Journals Are in OpenAlex?

Dr. Dimity Stephen[1], *Dr Rita Faria*[2], *Dr. Emanuel Kulczycki*[3,4]
[1]*German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Berlin, Germany,* [2]*School of Criminology, University of Porto; CIJ - Interdisciplinary Research Center on Justice, Porto, Portugal,* [3]*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland,* [4]*Science Studies (DZHW),*

Objective
OpenAlex is a promising new bibliometric database. Its openness and broad coverage – including non-English publications – is a key advantage, but it also means OpenAlex includes questionable journals (QJs). The inclusion of QJs is potentially problematic not only for researchers but also for users in policy or evaluation roles. Consequently, we investigated the prevalence and profile of QJs in OpenAlex.

Methods
We matched QJs from Cabells Predatory Reports (CPR) with OpenAlex based on ISSNs, publishers, and journal titles. We analysed the QJs by publisher, discipline, and compared metadata completeness with a comparable random sample of 245,212 publications not in CPR. We are also using criminological frameworks to develop a typology of the QJs (not) in OpenAlex, based on the number, severity, and type of violations reported in CPR, such as misleading fees or inadequate peer review. Mirroring official crime statistics, where the most severe crimes are less frequent, we hypothesise that OpenAlex will include QJs with milder violations, i.e. pickpockets rather than murderers, and that we will identify different profiles, including recidivists.

Results
We identified 6,143 QJs in OpenAlex, which collectively produced 1,844,904 publications. This constitutes 33.1% of the 18,570 QJs listed in CPR, and 2.9% of the 209,820 journals and 0.7% of the publications in OpenAlex. Over 550 publishers produced the QJs, and the two largest held 244 and 243 QJs in OpenAlex, or 3.9% each of all QJs. Most QJs were in health sciences (2,871, 35.8%), followed by social sciences and humanities (1,538, 19.2%), life sciences (1,375, 17.1%), engineering and technology (1,203, 15.0%), physical sciences (843, 10.5%), and multidisciplinary sciences (193, 2.4%). Metadata completeness was similar between QJ and non-QJ publications. The QJ profiling is currently underway, with results anticipated shortly.

Conclusion
We estimated the prevalence of QJs in OpenAlex, and will identify particular profiles of QJs (not) present. OpenAlex is rapidly being taken up by the community and understanding its content is thus vital. Our results likely underestimate QJs in OpenAlex as CPR presents a specific sample of such journals. Nonetheless, they provide valuable insight for users of this promising open database.

Culturally Sensitive Trauma Research in Africa: Integrating Language-informed Healing Strategies and Indigenous practices to Foster Research Integrity

Dr. Solange Swiri Tumasang[1]
[1]*University of Maroua, Maroua, Cameroon*

Trauma research in Africa is often hampered by cultural insensitivity, linguistic barriers, and neglect of indigenous practices, compromising research integrity, effectiveness, and community trust. This study aims to develop culturally sensitive trauma research methodologies that integrate language-informed healing strategies and indigenous practices, fostering research integrity and promoting effective trauma healing outcomes in African communities. By examining the intersection of language, culture, and trauma in Africa, this research seeks to adapt language-informed healing strategies and indigenous practices to promote trauma healing and research integrity. A mixed-methods approach is employed, utilizing a community-based participatory research design that engages local communities, traditional healers, and researchers in the development of trauma healing strategies. Linguistic analysis, ethnographic research, and participatory workshops are used to develop culturally sensitive research methodologies. The study is grounded in the Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT), which emphasizes the importance of cultural context in shaping human behavior and experiences. Preliminary findings indicate that culturally sensitive trauma healing strategies that integrate language-informed approaches and indigenous practices can enhance research integrity, community trust, and trauma healing outcomes. The study highlights the importance of linguistic and cultural adaptation in trauma research, demonstrating the potential of community-based participatory research approaches to foster effective trauma healing practices. This research has significant implications for trauma research and practice in Africa, providing a model for culturally sensitive research methodologies that prioritize indigenous practices and language-informed approaches. By prioritizing cultural sensitivity and participant-centered approaches, researchers can develop more effective trauma healing strategies that address the unique needs of African communities, ultimately promoting research integrity, community trust, and effective trauma healing outcomes. The study's findings can inform policy and practice in trauma research, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of trauma and healing in African contexts.

Embracing AI with Integrity – Translating Principles into Practice

Dr. Josephine Woodhams[1], *Kathryn Dally*[1], *Steph Neave*[1]
[1]*UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO), London, United Kingdom*

The use of AI throughout every stage of the research cycle is now widespread. However, the sheer diversity and rapid evolution of AI tools – combined with their wide-ranging application in research – have made the development of universal standards and rules inherently difficult, leaving researchers and institutions navigating a fragmented and fast-changing landscape. This presents a critical challenge for researchers, publishers, and funders – and for research integrity as a whole. Addressing this gap is essential to prevent breaches of research integrity that could cause lasting harm to research findings, the research community, society, and the environment.

In this context, UKRIO advocates a pragmatic approach to the use of AI in research, grounded in the well-established principles of research integrity: honesty, transparency, accountability, respect and rigour. Our recent publication, Embracing AI with Integrity: A practical guide for researchers, offers a flexible framework to support the responsible integration of AI into research and related activities, while identifying and mitigating risks – whether current, emerging, or as yet unknown.

The guide raises awareness of the potential integrity risks posed by AI and highlights areas where proactive steps can be taken to mitigate these. Using research integrity as a lens, it organises key challenges into five themes:
1. Breaching laws, regulations, and conditions
2. Ethical considerations
3. Protecting the research record
4. Research dissemination
5. Creativity and critical thinking.

These themes provide a practical structure for recognising and addressing research integrity risks, supporting stakeholders to adopt an informed, responsible, and ethical approach.

Embracing AI with Integrity was developed to meet the urgent need for practical guidance, while also recognising the use of AI in research is continually evolving. As such, it is intended as a living document and we actively encourage the research community to share feedback and contribute to its ongoing refinement, ensuring it reflects emerging risks, practices, and insights.

Ethically Responsible Uses of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Citations

*Dr. Samuel Bruton[1], Dr. Mohammad Hosseini[1], **Dr. Jennifer Wright***
[1]University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, USA

Objective
The aims of this presentation are twofold: 1) explain how the increasing use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has been changing citation practices (CP) in scholarly workflows; and 2) share a preliminary ethical analysis of challenges when using GenAI in CP and offer recommendations for researchers, institutions and publishers/journals.

Methods
This work extends our previous empirical work which distinguished three broad categories of ethically questionable CP (neglectful citation, biased citation, strategic citation). We rely on Shamoo and Resnik's framework of ethics of science to identify normative challenges caused by the use of GenAI.

Results
While GenAI offers convenience and speed, it introduces new risks, aggravating the problems of fake, inaccurate, and irrelevant citations and potentially introducing new forms of bias and fundamentally altering researchers' relationships to the knowledge commons. We identify two ethical issues calling them 1) the inaccuracy problem (i.e., citations that are hallucinated, irrelevant, outdated, retracted or of poor quality); and 2) the superficiality problem (i.e., changing researchers' relationships with the research literature).

Conclusions
The challenges of using GenAI in citation practices require coordinated action across researchers, publishers, and institutions. Researchers should verify all AI-assisted citation suggestions, scrutinize the rationale behind recommended sources, and align expectations about GenAI use within collaborations. Publishers and journals should implement automated screening for hallucinated, retracted or irrelevant citations, establish reliable reporting pathways to institutional research integrity offices, and address confirmed problems transparently through formal corrections or retractions rather than stealth edits. Institutions should strengthen AI literacy, develop clear policies for research-practice violations, and press GenAI developers for greater transparency regarding system accuracy, risks, and broader impacts, including environmental costs.

Addressing Research Integrity in Cross-Border Data Transfer for International Research Collaborations

Prof. Patrick Chun Man Wong[1], *Prof. Yuying Tong*[1], *Mr. Wai Lam Ng*[1], *Ms. Norris L P Liu*[1], *Prof Mai Har Sham*[1]
[1]*The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

Data transfer across countries is vital for addressing global challenges, fostering innovation, promoting open science and trustworthiness in research, and ensuring the generalizability of research findings across diverse populations, including those in the Global South. However, such partnerships raise significant concerns regarding research integrity, including imbalances in academic power, divergent ethical standards, risks to data security, and challenges to reproducibility. Additional challenges may also arise due to geopolitical forces, the prospect of dual use, and an evolving legal landscape that lacks clarity, which have concerned many researchers as they engage in cross-border research that requires the exchange and sharing of data. Transparent agreements, mutual accountability, and alignment with the principles of Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) are essential to overcoming these challenges.

As a global research hub and a bridge between East and West, we developed a comprehensive strategy to support research integrity in cross-border data transfer in the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK). The essential elements in our strategy include: 1) Development of a policy framework that outlines clear expectations for our researchers as they exchange data and materials with external non-local partners. 2) As the legal landscape is changing rapidly, professional legal and compliance support is needed to respond swiftly to changes that have implications for both ongoing research activities and agreements under negotiation, to advise university leadership and individual researchers accordingly. 3) Provide Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training that highlights important issues related to cross-border activities and require researchers to attend. The training also complements frequent workshops on data transfer and requires project leaders to develop a data management plan for large-scale projects, which often have partnerships involving multiple jurisdictions. 4) To align with CUHK's risk management process, we support our research teams to adopt a risk management rather than a risk avoidance approach when handling cross-border collaborations.

These efforts uphold research integrity by fostering trust, transparency, and reproducibility in cross-border research. We urge research partners around the globe to embed integrity into institutional policies, training, and risk management so that international collaborations can continue to make headway toward overcoming challenges of global scale.

Publications Facts Label: Making Research Integrity Public at the Article Level

Dr. John Willinsky[1]
[1]*Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada*

This presentation will introduce the Publication Facts Label (PFL). This is an open source plugin for journals that generates a label for each research article reporting platform data on ten scholarly publishing standards, from the article's number of reviewers to the journal's rejection rate. The Public Knowledge Project (PKP) has developed the PFL initially for its own journal publishing platforms (Open Journal Systems; OJS) with an eye to scholarly publishing industry adoption. While the publishing industry is focused on fraud-detection strategies for deterring and weeding out fraudulent research prior to publication, PKP seeks to complement that work with a clear public statement on every research article indicating in detail the care that has gone into research reliability. The data it provides on reviewers, for example, is aimed at thwarting predatory journals and reviewer cabals. It is also designed to counter declining public confidence in research and scientists by providing linked information explaining each of the PFL's data points. The PFL builds on the common Nutrition Facts Label's success in presenting factual data to the public that has been shown to influence consumer behavior. The PFL has been developed in consultation with over 100 journal editors, researchers, science journalists, high school students, and their families. In terms of reviews, it was the subject of Nature's Question of the Week, with 73% of 3,785 readers finding it "would be useful" (Apr 19 2024). At an OASPA publishers' presentation, 72 out of 73 attendees thought it would be "a useful addition to journals" (Sep 24 2024). In a 130-journal PFL trial, of the 201 readers who opened the PFL, the "public" readers (21%) ranked its usefulness highest at 4.4/5 (Jun 25 2025). Currently, the PFL is being rolled out among journals employing PKP's OJS, with an update included in the presentation, along with a status report on continuing discussions with scholarly publishers and platform developers on plans for industry-wide adoption and governance.

Evidence Integrity in Medical Device Regulatory Science: A Scoping Review of Methodologies for Clinical and Performance Evidence in the EU

Dr. Miro Vukovic[1], *Dr Ružica Bandić*[1], *Nensi Bralić*[1], *Prof. Ana Marušić*[1]
[1]*University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia*

Background and Objective
Medical Device Regulation and In Vitro Diagnostic Regulation set the rules for certifying medical devices in the European Union. These rules require the ongoing collection and analysis of clinical and performance evidence. Even with these legal frameworks, there is still not enough methodological transparency and consistency in how evidence is created, evaluated, and synthesized to ensure the integrity of research and regulatory procedures. To address these issues, a scoping review was performed as a part of the Horizon Europe EU4MEDTECH project to map the methods for clinical and performance evidence generation and integration for high-risk medical devices and in vitro diagnostics.

Methods
We performed a search of bibliographic (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science) and grey literature sources (CORDIS, MedTech Europe, JAMS) for records published since 2017. The search was conducted on January 30th, 2025. Eligible studies examined study designs, the utilization of real-world data (RWD) and registries, post-market surveillance, life-cycle assessment, and evidence integration. Researchers verified all outputs after extracting data through a hybrid process that combined manual review and AI-assisted text mining using OpenAI GPT-4o to help with mapping and synthesis.

Results
Eighty-nine studies satisfied the inclusion criteria. A significant degree of heterogeneity was noted in methodological approaches, terminology, and regulatory interpretations. Randomized controlled trials were considered to provide the best evidence, but most device evidence came from non-randomized, observational, and RWD studies that did not always provide transparent methodology. Different regulatory requirements in EU member states hinder standardization and reproducibility of results. This approach raises the risk of selective evidence reporting and regulatory bias ("forum shopping"). Challenges also include incomplete data from registries, a lack of open data practices, and inconsistent quality appraisal of real-world evidence (RWE) studies.

Conclusions
Our findings underscore systemic risks to research integrity in medical device research for regulatory purposes due to ambiguous methodologies, inconsistent standards, and restricted public access to the data informing regulatory decisions. Consistent methodological guidance, open data requirements, and clear evaluations of RWE are needed. Adding integrity principles to regulatory science would make the evidence that supports medical device certification more trustworthy, reproducible, and accountable.

Benefits and Challenges of AI Use in English Writing Instruction: Experiences from Graduate Teaching Assistants

Mr. Md Abdullah Al Younus[1]
[1]*Florida Atlantic University, BOCA RATON, USA*

Artificial Intelligence, especially ChatGPT, has brought a new dimension to the education sector, especially in the domain of Academic Writing (AW). Though educational technologies assist writers by promoting critical thinking, clarity, and linguistic accuracy, they cause some challenges in traditional understanding of authorship, originality, and ethical concerns. This study investigates the perceptions of 20 Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) of the English Department, Florida Atlantic University (FAU), USA, about the benefits and ethical issues of AI in academic writing. The study employs interview questionnaires (Google Forms and Sheets) and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) tools to collect participants' reflections and perceptions about AI in academic writing. To analyze data, the study follows the thematic data analysis method using NVivo software. It also explores the multifaceted roles of AI in idea generation and structural organization along with grammatical enhancement. Hypothetical findings reveal that GTAs value AI as a resource for efficiency, cognitive development, and language polishing support but share deep concerns about authorship, loss of critical engagement, and most importantly, digression of tone and voice of writing. The analysis underscores the tension between benefits and challenges, outlining that AI has potential academic support, but overreliance may greatly impact ethical standards and intellectual development. The paper argues for a framework of responsible integration of AI, especially with institutional consent, since AI functions as a complementary tool rather than a substitute for human thought and authorship. Recommendations include the development of clear institutional guidelines, transparency in AI use, and pedagogical practices and training that foster critical AI literacy along with technological advancement.

POSTER PRESENTATIONS

May 4, 2026, 12:00 PM - 1:30 PM

P.01

Paper Mills Meet AI: A Case from India

Dr. Anna Abalkina[1], *Dr. Svetlana Kleiner*[2]
[1]*Freie Universität of Berlin, Berlin, Germany,* [2]*Springer Nature, Dordrecht, The Netherlands*

Objective
Patterns of paper mills evolve depending on their country of origin and disciplines of specialization. The objective of this study is to analyze the patterns of an Indian paper mill, focusing only on major publishers.

Design
The Indian paper mill uses specific email addresses for paper submission, whose Latvian domains do not correspond to the country of affiliation or contain identical parts of the email name. By searching for these emails in Scopus, it was possible to retrieve papers. Each paper was examined for the unique template characteristics of the paper mill. The papers have been retrieved and analyzed in Scopus.

Results
489 papers were identified that included either a specific email address or the paper mill's template. These papers are associated with 28 countries and 180 journals. Among them, 309 papers (63.2%) were published in Springer journals, 61 (12.5%) in Taylor & Francis, 51 (10.4%) in Wiley, 39 (8.0%) in Elsevier, and 11 (2.2%) in Sage. While 66% of the papers are associated with India, 28% are linked to China, and 6% to Saudi Arabia. The paper mill operates in several disciplines, such as computer science, engineering, mathematics, and psychology.
Papers from this paper mill contain statistical inconsistencies and likely AI-generated statistical data. In 2024 the paper mill doubled the number of published papers which have the traces of AI use, suggesting that paper mills actively use ChatGPT or similar tools to mass-produce papers.
Despite numerous errors in the statistical tables, the papers still passed peer review. Only four papers have been retracted as of September 2025.

Conclusion
This study shows that papers originating from paper mills are published in major journals and often go undetected during the peer review process. Paper mills also proliferate due to the use of AI. The diversity of paper mills and their unique patterns make it difficult to identify such papers at scale using universal methods, which poses a challenge for the prevention and correction of the scientific literature. This study is limited to the analysis of a single paper mill.

P.03

Research Integrity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Opportunities

Dr. Tayewo Adewumi[1]
[1]*Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin, Nigeria*

Objective
This study aims to critically examine the evolving landscape of research integrity in the context of artificial intelligence (AI). It explores how AI technologies both challenge and enhance ethical standards, transparency, and accountability in academic research, with a focus on identifying key risks and opportunities for institutional and scholarly governance.

Methods
A conceptual analysis will be conducted using interdisciplinary literature from ethics, computer science, and research policy. The study synthesizes theoretical frameworks and expert commentaries to map the intersections between AI capabilities and integrity principles. No empirical data were collected; instead, the research relies on normative reasoning and comparative case illustrations.

Results
AI introduces both disruptive risks and transformative benefits to research integrity. On one hand, algorithmic bias, data fabrication, and opaque decision-making processes pose significant threats to reproducibility and ethical compliance. Automated writing tools and generative models may facilitate plagiarism or uncertain authorship accountability. Moreover, the rapid deployment of AI systems often outpaces regulatory oversight, creating gaps in institutional safeguards. On the other hand, AI offers promising tools for enhancing integrity. Machine learning algorithms can detect anomalies in datasets, flag potential misconduct, and streamline peer review processes. Natural language processing aids in plagiarism detection and citation verification, while predictive analytics can identify patterns of questionable research practices. Institutions leveraging AI responsibly may improve transparency, reduce human error, and foster a culture of ethical vigilance. The dual nature of AI necessitates a recalibration of research norms, emphasizing digital literacy, algorithmic accountability, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Ethical frameworks must evolve to address AI-specific dilemmas, and researchers must be equipped to critically engage with these technologies.

Conclusion
AI's integration into research demands a proactive and nuanced approach to integrity. While it offers tools for ethical enhancement, unchecked use may erode foundational principles. Institutions must invest in policy development, researcher training, and cross-sector dialogue to ensure AI serves as a catalyst. not a compromise for responsible scholarship.

P.05

Understanding Research Integrity Challenges in the Age of AI: A Survey-Based Study Across African Institutions

Mr. Abiodun Akindele[3]
[1]*University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria,* [2]*International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), Washington, DC, USA,* [3]*African Research Integrity Network (ARIN), Cape Town, South Africa*

Objective
This study investigates how research professionals and administrators across African universities perceive and respond to AI-related integrity challenges, focusing on algorithmic accountability, synthetic data validation, and automated authorship in resource-constrained institutional contexts.

Method
A cross-sectional survey was administered across African Institutions. However, twelve (12) research professionals from leading Nigerian and South African institutions, including University of Ibadan, North-West University, Bayero University, and University of Jos have responded. Respondents comprised researchers, administrators, and policy makers, with 67% holding doctoral degrees.

Results
Findings reveal a significant awareness-implementation gap across all domains. While 75% recognize algorithmic accountability as very or extremely important, only 8% report adequate transparency in current systems. All participants expressed moderate to very high ethical concerns about synthetic data bias, with 83% emphasizing validation importance, yet institutional protocols remain inconsistent. The automated authorship domain presents acute concerns: 67% perceive AI-assisted writing as high or critical integrity risks, but only 42% of institutions have formal guidelines. Detection confidence varies dramatically, with 50% reporting low confidence levels. Only one institution has implemented adaptive protocols despite universal recognition of flexibility's importance. Institutional inertia emerges as a primary barrier, with 42% uncertain whether policies address AI challenges. However, 92% expressed interest in regional collaborations for harmonized frameworks.

Conclusion
African research institutions must urgently transition from awareness to action by developing explicit AI policies, establishing validation protocols, creating adaptive governance mechanisms, and leveraging regional collaboration to address emerging AI-related research integrity challenges.
Keywords: Research integrity, artificial intelligence, algorithmic accountability, synthetic data, automated authorship, adaptive governance, African universities

P.07

Realised and Possible Applications of Scholarly Metadata for Research Integrity in Editorial Workflows

Dr. Madhura Amdekar[1]
[1]*Crossref, Netherlands*

Objective
Journal editors play a central role in ensuring the integrity of the work that is published but may not be fully aware of the benefits of rich metadata for research integrity, with much of this information being confined to production or technical teams. Scholarly metadata, which is data about scholarly works, is a rich source of information that can be used to assess the trustworthiness of published research outputs. By answering questions such as who authored the work, who was it published by, who funded it, was it retracted after publication, and more, open scholarly metadata has the potential to be used as a signal of trust by the scholarly community. The objective of this project was to understand how journal editors interact with scholarly metadata in editorial workflows and to identify opportunities for implementing metadata as trust signals in their workflows.

Methods
Editors were identified from small, medium, and large Crossref member organisations and invited to participate in workshops. In these workshops we determined the various stages of the editorial workflows where editors interact with metadata, the specific metadata elements that they use at each of those stages, and the potential applications of this metadata for preserving the integrity of the scholarly record.

Results
Results from a pilot interview indicate that the title of the manuscript, author names and their ORCID records, are used by editors to assess the novelty of a manuscript before publication. This showcases an opportunity to highlight the role of this metadata for research integrity because titles provide context and information about a work, while contributor metadata which includes ORCID iDs, link research outputs to their contributors. The full results from a further set of planned workshops will be presented at the conference.

Conclusion
The project aims to ascertain the metadata elements that editors encounter in their workflows and to highlight novel uses of this metadata in editorial workflows. Via this exercise, we would like to draw the attention of editors towards applications of scholarly metadata for research integrity that they may leverage in their workflows.

P.09

A Holistic Conceptual Account of Research Integrity: Implications for Mindset and Strategies in Its Pursuit

Dr. John Barugahare[1], *Beth Mutumba*[2], *Mrs. Irene Ssemakula*[2], *Ms. Hellen Opolot*[2]
[1]*Department of Philosophy, School of Liberal and Performing Arts, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda,* [2]*Directorate of Research Management and Quality Assurance, Uganda National Council of Science and Technology, Kampala, Uganda*

Objective
Existing conceptualizations of research integrity are comprehensive but fragmented, hence, difficulty in cultivating a mindset and strategies for its pursuit. Using philosophical and practical lenses, this paper provides a holistic conceptual account of 'research integrity', plus corollary mindset and strategies for its pursuit.

Methods
The paper uses a critical analysis strategy to propose a normative holistic conceptualization of research integrity. Using a deductive approach, the paper draws on the lexical definition of 'integrity', uses premises from diverse conceptualizations of research integrity, and insights from philosophy of science, to logically conceptualize the concept of research integrity, and suggest strategies for its pursuit.

Results
Lexically, integrity' refers to an unimpaired condition and soundness; and uncompromising adherence to codes of moral and artistic values. Indeed, a synthesis of diverse conceptualizations of research integrity is that it is a pursuit of credibility of research evidence, and the ethical propriety of processes in research. Credibility of research evidence is possible by a scientific mindset, understood as mastery of methodological rigour, and appreciation of, and commitment to epistemic values. Ethical propriety research in processes is possible through ethical knowledge and ethical conscience. Both of these require deep and sustained cultivation. However, increasingly, perspectives on the ethical dimension are incorporating instrumental values of research as a critical constituent of the concept of research integrity. This is reflected in the growing tendency to include elements of open science practices and the relevance or responsiveness of research to society. Hence, holistically, research integrity ought to be understood as a pursuit of credibility of research evidence, the ethicality of research processes, and optimal utility of research to society. Consequently, the achievement of research integrity depends on technical competence in methodological rigour, ethical knowledge, and commitment to epistemic, ethical, and instrumental values in research.

Conclusion
Building a robust research integrity culture requires intentional cultivation and certification of researchers' methodological and ethical competences, and indebtedness to epistemic, ethical, and instrumental values in research. Given human epistemic fallibility, moral imperfection, and constrained altruism, researchers' competences for, and voluntary commitment to research integrity should be complemented by a robust support-cum-enforcement mechanism.

P.11

Strengthening a Supportive Data Sharing Environment: Reflections From the Data Sharing Practices at the MRC/UVRI and LSHTM Uganda Research Unit

Mr. Samuel Jacob Bengo[1], *Dorothy Ainembabazi*[1], *Geofrey Kimbugwe*[1]
[1]*Mrc/uvri & Lshtm Uganda Research Unit, Non Us, Uganda*

Background
Data sharing is critical in stimulating innovative research ideas while enhancing sustainability more so in the constrained research funding environment. Balancing openness and data protection has become a central challenge in research collaboration. In low and middle income countries, ensuring compliance with data protection regulations while maintaining transparency can be particularly complex.
The MRC/UVRI and LSHTM Uganda Research Unit provides a unique case of a complex research collaboration with which lessons can be learned that have fostered meaningful data sharing in a bid to improve health worldwide. In this abstract, we reflect on the Unit's practical experiences, strategies, and lessons in enhancing data sharing.

Methods
When research data is to be shared between investigators or institutions, the process begins with a review by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine contracts team, who assess the Data Transfer Agreement. At the MRC/UVRI and LSHTM Uganda Research Unit, this agreement is further reviewed by the internal independent Data Access Committee and the Research Governance Office to ensure alignment with national regulations and ethical standards. Specifically, compliance with the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology Research Guidelines and the Data Protection and Privacy Act (2019) is required. Negotiations are conducted between the provider and recipient institutions until consensus is reached. Once signed by the parties, these are submitted to the Research Ethics Committee.

Results
Our experience demonstrates that a structured approach to data sharing fosters trust and accountability in collaborative research. Key strategies include:1)early and transparent communication between collaborating institutions 2)clear articulation of roles, responsibilities, and governance structures for data access 3)compliance to institutional, national, and international data protection requirements 4)implementation of secure mechanisms for data transfer and storage; and 5)agreement on intellectual property rights, data ownership, and publication plans to safeguard both scientific integrity and participant interests.

Conclusion
Investing in robust data sharing policies and platforms is essential in enhancing equitable and sustainable research collaboration while safeguarding participant rights and national interests. By embedding legal, ethical, and technical safeguards into data sharing processes, institutions can foster research integrity, ensure compliance, and enable responsible global collaboration

P.13

BigFile Finder: Enhancing Access, Searchability, Sharing and Analysis of Microscopy Data

Dr. Antoine Borensztejn[1], *Sean L. Meharry*[1], *Gabe Medrash*[1], *Ms. Anya Wallace*[1], *Brian Whitney*[1], *Lyndsay Wilhelm*[1], *Dr. Nathalie Gaudreault*[1], *Graham Johnson*[1]
[1]*Allen Institute for Cell Science, Seattle, USA*

The Allen Institute for Cell Science developed BigFile Finder (BFF), a web-based, open-source application that enables fast, intuitive search, aggregation, management, and sharing of imaging data. Designed to support novel insights and reproducible science, BFF reduces redundant pixel storage while promoting FAIR data practices. Its robust search engine allows users to locate specific images from both user-supplied and public datasets, accelerating data exploration and discovery. A user-friendly interface provides instant access to image thumbnails, rich metadata, and experimental context, with flexible options to open full-resolution images in a variety of viewer applications. By lowering technical barriers to accessing and reusing microscopy datasets, BFF serves as a practical gateway to more FAIR and impactful data sharing.
BFF has already supported two publications by enabling direct sharing of study datasets and figure-specific data. It also introduces the “Used For” concept in bioimaging, allowing readers to access the exact raw microscopy data behind each figure with a single click. By linking datasets to interactive visualizations, such as live image exploration through Vol-E, BFF transforms publications from static to dynamic, shifting from trust-based to directly verifiable research. BigFile Finder is freely available at bff.allencell.org.

P.15

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) culture of a University with Global Reach

Prof. Wade Bishop[1], Seongkyoon Jeong, Jason Hayward, Gregory Stuart, Prof. Samantha Ehrlich, Phillip Myer, ***Mrs. Jane Burns***
[1]University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

Objective
Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) culture includes all activities included in engaging in research with ethical purposes and integral practices. At the University of Tennessee, existing RCR training benefits from being informed by current researchers' attitudes and awareness of RCR topics and trainings.

Method
A campus-wide integrity instrument of faculty, post-doctoral research fellows, and graduate students at a large R1 US Research Institution will be conducted to provide survey results of RCR attitudes and awareness of topics and trainings among all representative members of a research community, at the campus level.

Results
The survey will be launched in Fall 2025 and analyses are ongoing. Preliminary results from workshop assessments that informed the survey indicate campus RCR culture is robust, and awareness is high on most topics. Further training is desired in: authorship, use of AI in research, and managing and sharing research data.

Conclusion
Findings from this survey will inform the focus of future RCR training at our institution and provide a guide to develop integrity instruments and trainings at other institutions. The snapshot of attitudes and awareness on RCR gives a baseline reading to inform future work on competence assessment.

P.17

Protecting People to Advance Science Globally: Sexual Harassment Prevention as a Pillar of Scientific Integrity and Research Security

Dr. Tiffany Chenneville[1]
[1]*University Of South Florida, St. Petersburg, USA*

The ethical foundations of global research rest on mutual responsibility and respect among scientists, educators, and institutions across cultures. Across continents, sexual harassment persists as a pervasive barrier to equitable participation in science. It constitutes not only a violation of human rights but also a profound threat to research integrity and security worldwide. The purpose of this presentation is to present the argument that preventing sexual harassment is an ethical obligation central to what researchers, institutions, and professional communities owe one another in a globally interconnected scientific enterprise.

Sexual harassment undermines trust, silences voices, and disrupts the collaborative exchange upon which international research depends. Its consequences—lost talent, damaged credibility, and fractured professional cultures—extend beyond individual harm to weaken global scientific capacity. When misconduct drives women and early-career researchers from the field, entire regions and disciplines suffer cumulative losses of innovation, insight, and leadership.

Traditionally, research security frameworks have emphasized external risks such as espionage or data theft. Here internal threats are reframed-harassment, coercion, and abuse of authority—as equally corrosive to ethical and secure research environments. Situating sexual harassment prevention within global conversations about responsible conduct, research equity, and cross-cultural collaboration highlights how local action contributes to collective ethical resilience.

Drawing on scholarship in scientific integrity, feminist ethics, and international policy, the author proposes four interdependent strategies for global ethical culture change: (1) disrupting entrenched power hierarchies; (2) embedding inclusivity and equity in institutional systems; (3) strengthening accountability and transparency across borders; and (4) fostering openness and mutual respect as universal norms of collaboration.

The central argument is that sexual harassment prevention is not a peripheral compliance activity but a moral and professional imperative essential to sustaining ethical, trustworthy, and globally secure science. In a time when international cooperation is vital to address shared challenges—from climate change to public health—protecting people within research environments is both a human duty and a prerequisite for the progress of science itself.

P.19

Ethical and Methodological Challenges in Adolescent E-Cigarette Research: Reflections on Consent, Representation, and Research Integrity in Sensitive Public Health Studies

Dr. Surarong Chinwong[1], *Dr. Dujrudee Chinwong*[1], *Ms. Pattaranan Duangin*[1], *Mr. Wachirawit Chumpa*[1]
[1]*Faculty of Pharmacy. Chiang Mai University, Suthep Subdistrict, Mueang District., Thailand*

Research on e-cigarette use among adolescents raises complex ethical and methodological challenges that directly intersect with research integrity. This reflection discusses the ethical approval process, consent procedures, and data reliability issues encountered during a prevalence survey on e-cigarette use among lower secondary school students in one province of Thailand. The project aimed to estimate vaping prevalence and explore behavioral correlates among early adolescents, yet the process of obtaining parental consent for minors significantly influenced participation and the credibility of findings.

All research procedures complied with international ethical standards, including parental notification and consent prior to student participation. However, these ethically essential steps created unintended practical barriers: many eligible adolescents declined to request parental permission because they feared disclosure or suspicion of their own e-cigarette use. Consequently, participation among actual users was disproportionately low, likely leading to an underestimation of true prevalence.

Notably, the study design ensured participant anonymity, and the questionnaire items were not overly intrusive, focusing on behaviors rather than identity or sensitive personal details. This raises a critical question: when participant privacy and minimal risk are already safeguarded, might strict parental consent requirements represent an overprotection that compromises data validity and inclusiveness?

This case exemplifies the tension between protecting participants and ensuring the accuracy and completeness of public health evidence. Overly rigid ethical procedures, though grounded in participant protection, can unintentionally weaken the integrity of findings in studies of stigmatized behaviors.

The reflection calls for context-sensitive ethical frameworks that balance protection with proportionality, respect for autonomy, and cultural realities. Transparent reporting of these ethical–methodological trade-offs is essential for responsible research practice and for maintaining trust in adolescent health research, particularly in low- and middle-income contexts where cultural norms and parental authority strongly shape participation.

P.21

Comparative Analysis of AI Policies Among Major Scientific Publishers (Elsevier, Wiley, Sage, Springer, Taylor & Francis) and COPE

Dr. Reda Cimmperman, *Dr. Rima Sinickė*[1]
[1]*Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius, Lithuania*

Objective
This presentation outlines the results of a comparative analysis of the use of AI in the preparation of scientific publications by major scientific publishers - Elsevier, Wiley, SAGE, Springer, Taylor & Francis - and COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics).

Methods
Review and systematic comparison of publicly available AI policies provided by publishers Elsevier, Wiley, SAGE, Springer, Taylor & Francis, and COPE.
Five main points were selected for comparison:
1. Can AI be listed as an author?
2. Scope of AI use by authors
3. Can AI be used to create images?
4. Where and how to disclose the use of AI
5. Whether and how reviewers can use AI

Results
The analysis showed that either publishers neither COPE allows to disclose AI as an author. Publishers differ significantly regarding permissible AI usage: for example, Elsevier and Springer allows to use AI only for language editing, while other publishers allow broader applications such as idea generation, data synthesis, and structure. Elsevier, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Wiley do not allow the use of AI-generated images or figures in submitted manuscripts, especially when such images are related to research data. While Wiley, Taylor & Francis permit AI-generated explanatory or conceptual images under certain conditions. Clear disclosure of AI use is universally required, typically in the Methods or Acknowledgements section.
In most cases, reviewers are not allowed to upload manuscripts or any part of them into AI tools due to confidentiality and copyright concerns (COPE, Elsevier, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Wiley). SAGE and Wiley allow reviewers to use AI tools to improve the language of their review comments as long as they take full responsibility for the content.

Conclusion
While there is a strong consensus that AI cannot be an author, there remains variation among publishers regarding permissible AI uses. Publishers generally encourage AI transparency, but the specifics vary, highlighting the need for authors to carefully adhere to individual publisher guidelines.

P.23

Enhancing Research Integrity Education Through Case-Based Learning on Questionable Research Practices

Dr. Ilinca Ciubotariu[1], *Gundula Bosch*[1]
[1]*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA*

Objective
This work examines how graduate students across STEM disciplines identify and interpret questionable research practices (QRPs) when engaging with a new, structured, case-based learning activity in a research ethics course. The aim was to assess students' conceptual understanding of key QRPs and evaluate this case-based instructional approach, following evidence of limited understanding from a previous assignment that requested students to find examples of QRPs on the web.

Method
Students(n=163) individually analyzed a case adapted from a retracted COVID-19 pilot trial on ivermectin that exemplified multiple QRPs, and responded to guided questions about the practices, mitigation strategies, and their impact on research conclusions. Responses were anonymized and thematically coded for QRPs represented in the case: hypothesis myopia, confirmation bias, selective reporting/omission, overstating conclusions, and the lack of statistical rigor or poor study design.

Results
Most students demonstrated stronger conceptual recognition of QRPs compared to the previous assignment, where many struggled to differentiate among them. In this cohort, 93% identified lack of statistical rigor or poor study design, noting the small sample size and inadequate analysis. Sixty-three percent recognized selective reporting or omission of data, while 57 students explicitly described hypothesis myopia, and 20 discussed confirmation bias. Qualitative coding further showed that students not only described the QRPs but contextualized them within systemic factors such as publication pressure, inadequate peer review, and pandemic urgency. Compared to the previous exercise, the case-based approach elicited richer, more critical reasoning and explicit reflection on research integrity as a process rather than a checklist. Several students even connected QRPs to broader consequences, including public misinformation, erosion of trust in science, and the need for transparency.

Conclusion
Our instruction integrating a case study we developed to emphasize QRPs meaningfully improved student understanding of QRPs by fostering critical analysis, ethical reasoning, and recognition of contextual influences on research integrity. While most students demonstrated nuanced understanding, some described QRPs without naming them explicitly, suggesting future instruction could be improved by connecting conceptual reasoning to formal terminology. Lastly, we argue that this form of pedagogy provides a promising, scalable model for cultivating deeper engagement with research integrity across disciplines.

P.25

Alleged AI Fraud in Dissertations Calls for a New Ethical Pedagogy

Prof. Gustaaf Cornelis[1,2], ***Ms. Marijke Van Vlasselaer***[1]
[1]*Free University Brussels (VUB), Brussels, Belgium,* [2]*Universiteit Antwerpen (UA), Antwerp, Belgium*

They should all have received clear instructions on the do's and don'ts of using generative AI during their studies, yet master's students were cheating while writing their theses using ChatGPT or other chatbots. Although these adolescents can be expected to have developed a full moral compass, fed with academic rules and specific instructions, the mixed approach by instructions about ethical codes and the threat of harsh punishment clearly does not suffice. Some academics hope that the high success rate of the disciplinary committees will bring the next generation of master students to think twice before adapting generative AI. However, academic education based on deterrence by reprisals is not one we want to adhere to from a pedagogical and humanistic point of view.

Yet, we need to acknowledge that what AI-fraud exactly means is unclear, not in the least because of the rapid increase of AI-applications continuously creates a grey zone, making it difficult to know, for students and academics, how to behave and judge correctly. Factual proof was often impossible to establish; hearings of students about their presumed misconduct held at our university frequently turned into semantic discussions.

In this study we line-up causes and reasons of the fraud-like behavior. By social engineering on campus, it might still be possible to change the growing mentality by some students using all possible measures to get a diploma with as less commitment as possible, even risking being inadmissible for several years to campus life.

We adhere the hypothesis that motivation and interest are strong factors, as well are obsessive dependence on ICT and social media, and the ignorance (or negligence) of the generative AI's footprint and deterring epistemological effects. We propose the installment of F2F-reflection peer groups and classroom discussions about (ethical and scientific) values in the curriculum, next to the (limited) instructions on the (correct and efficient) use of generative AI already offered; the latter supplemented by the negative implications of generative AI for environment and science. Our work will contribute to the discussion about legitimate generative AI-use on campus and the pedagogical task of universities.

P.27

Neocolonial Influences of Research Misconduct in Non-Western Contexts: Qualitative Insights from Nepal

Mr. Bibek Dahal[1], ***Dr. Aliya Kuzhabekova***[1]
[1]*University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada*

Objective
In this conference session, while exploring individual, institutional, cultural, situational, and structural factors, we pay particular attention to the impact of neo-colonial influences on research misconduct in non-Western contexts, bringing qualitative insights from the developing country of Nepal.

Methods
The data for the qualitative inquiry was collected using semi-structured interviews from faculty members from Nepali universities (N = 10). We recruited participants through a purposive sampling. We analysed data thematically using the combination of two theoretical frameworks: Davis's (2003) conceptual model of research misconduct and Smith's (2021) decolonizing methodologies.

Results
In this preliminary thematic analysis, we identified six recurring themes, revealing the various factors influencing researchers to involve in research misconduct in non-Western contexts. In addition to the various individual, situational, organizational, institutional and cultural factors identified in prior studies, our study revealed a pressing challenge of neocolonial influences worsening research misconduct issues. The majority of participants believe that Euro-western frameworks for defining research misconduct are not appropriate for the context of Nepal, marginalizing local or Indigenous knowledge production and transformation practices. They point that most studies conducted in Nepal by foreign researchers are irrelevant to the needs of Nepali communities, the results are interpreted without the engagement of local stakeholders and are not communicated via culturally-specific channels. Participants also criticize the exploitative behaviours of scholars from the Global North, stressing neocolonial dynamics producing double standards and leading to marginalization of Nepali researchers. They also express concerns about the impact of neocolonial dynamics on preservation and development of indigenous knowledge and theories.

Conclusion
The study reveals that one of the reasons for the growing incidence of research misconduct in contexts with lower research capacity may be linked to neo-colonial structures permeating modern global knowledge production system. It also discusses that existing conceptualizations of research integrity, as well as framings of misconduct might be part of the neo-colonial ideological system, which may contribute to growing research misconduct.

P.29

Methodological Coherence in Dyadic Qualitative Research: A Systematic Review of Practices in Relationship Science

Ms. Adira Daniel[1]
[1]*University Of Western Ontario, , Canada*

Objective
Qualitative methods are increasingly used to capture multiple perspectives in intimate and family relationships, yet standards for transparency and methodological coherence remain underdeveloped in relationship science. Dyadic interviews, where two participants are interviewed together, are common but inconsistently reported. This study systematically reviews dyadic qualitative research in romantic relationship science to identify practices, trends, and gaps in methodological coherence.

Method
A systematic review was conducted of peer-reviewed journal articles reporting dyadic qualitative studies of romantic relationships. Eligible studies were coded for study characteristics, epistemological and philosophical positions, methodological coherence (alignment across research questions, data collection, and analysis), and reporting practices. Analyses examine trends across journals and over time.

Results
Preliminary analysis (ongoing) indicates substantial inconsistency in articulating philosophical frameworks, justifying analytic approaches, and reporting methodological decisions. Few studies explicitly described their epistemological stance, and many used analytic strategies (e.g., thematic analysis, grounded theory) without connecting them to broader methodological traditions. Variability was observed across journals and time periods, with some high-quality exemplars demonstrating strong coherence and transparency. No previous review has systematically assessed methodological coherence in this domain, leaving researchers without consolidated guidance for designing and reporting dyadic qualitative studies. Full results, including a synthesis of trends and exemplars of best practice, will be presented at the conference.

Conclusion
This review identifies significant variability and gaps in how dyadic qualitative research is designed and reported in relationship science. Consolidating best practices and highlighting methodologically coherent exemplars will provide practical guidance for researchers adopting qualitative methods, strengthen transparency and reflexivity, and advance responsible research practices in the social sciences.

P.33

Improving Reporting Quality By Providing Pre-Publication Feedback to Authors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Dr. Maria Economou[1], *Carlijn Hooijmans*[2], *Torsten Rackoll*[1], *Dr. Stephanie Zellers*[3], *Daria Gramenitskaya*[4], *Dr. Kaitlyn Hair*[5], *Sean Smith*[4], *Prof. Malcolm Macleod*[4], *Prof. Ana Marušić*[6], *Miss Dora Pejdo*[6], *Dr. Kimberley Wever*[2], *Emily Sena*[4], *Dr. Sarah McCann*[1]

[1]*QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin, Germany,* [2]*Radboud University Medical Center, Department of Anaesthesiology, Pain and Palliative Medicine, Nijmegen, The Netherlands,* [3]*Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland,* [4]*Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK,* [5]*EPPI Centre, UCL Social Research Institute, University College London, London, UK,* [6]*Department of Research in Biomedicine and Health and Center for Evidence-based Medicine, University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia*

Objective

Despite widespread endorsement of standardised reporting guidelines by journals, completeness of reporting of scientific publications remains suboptimal, contributing to poor replicability and reproducibility. Active implementation strategies, such as providing specific reporting instructions to authors, have been proposed as promising approaches to further improve reporting quality. In this systematic review, we synthesise the available evidence on the efficacy of providing pre-publication feedback on reporting quality to authors as an intervention to improve reporting.

Method

A protocol for this review was preregistered on Open Science Framework (doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/7KMXZ). A comprehensive search was conducted in the Improving Reproducibility In Science consortium's Systematic Online Living Evidence Summary (iRISE-SOLES; https://camarades.shinyapps.io/irise-soles/), a curated database of interventions and tools to improve reproducibility of scientific findings. This search was complemented by grey literature searches and citation searching. A total of 2734 unique records were retrieved. Studies were eligible for inclusion if they reported primary data on interventions that aim to improve reporting by providing specific feedback to authors before publication, compared to general or no feedback. After screening by at least two independent reviewers, six randomised controlled trials and one observational study were included. Data extraction of study, intervention and outcome-level characteristics is currently ongoing, including the methods for providing feedback to authors and the tools used to measure reporting quality. We also extract information related to EDI (equity, diversity and inclusion) dimensions to better understand the characteristics of the publications and their authors and identify potential biases. We will conduct a risk of bias assessment using the ROB2 tool for randomised controlled trials and the ROBANS2 tool for non-randomised studies. The findings will be synthesised descriptively, but where sufficient and suitable outcome data for pooling are available, a meta-analysis will be performed. Results of the completed review will be presented at the conference.

Conclusion

This evidence synthesis will provide novel insights into the effectiveness of providing pre-publication feedback on reporting quality to authors as an intervention to improve reporting quality. The synthesised knowledge will contribute to evidence-based guidance on improving transparency and will inform the design and testing of future interventions in this domain.

P.35

Enhancing Research Security and Integrity Through Verified Researcher Identity: The Role of opensci.id in the Science Ecosystem

Prof. Gunther Eysenbach[1,2,3], *Nathaniel Gore*[1,2,3]
[1]*JMIR Publications, Toronto, Canada,* [2]*Laboratory for AI and Innovation in Scholarly Communication (LAIISC), School of Health Information Science, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada,* [3]*OpenSci Foundation, Delaware, USA*

Scientific progress depends on openness, transparency, and collaboration, principles which increasingly intersect with elements of research security. In everyday life, robust identity verification is expected to prevent fraud and protect security, whether opening a bank account, signing legal documents, or accessing sensitive systems. By contrast, scholarly communication has long operated on a foundation of assumed trust: it's relatively easy to claim an identity and contribute to the scholarly record with minimal, if any, verification. As instances of research fraud, paper mills, and falsified authorship rise, this leniency has become a vulnerability. Cases of authors creating "fake reviewers" to review their own manuscripts or fake guest editors with unvalidated credentials have risen in the past couple of years.

opensci.id (https://opensci.id/), a core component of the emerging OpenSci Ecosystem, offers a privacy-preserving, researcher-centric identity verification layer to open science. Building on the widespread adoption of ORCiD® as a persistent identifier, opensci.id verifies the real-world identity associated with an ORCiD® record through a secure, standards-based process involving government ID check and AI-based sanity checks. Once verified, researchers can use their opensci.id across the OpenSci Ecosystem - including peer-reviewing preprints on a community-based open peer review platform (the Ark), ensuring that contributions to the scholarly record are both attributable and accountable. Participating journals and platforms encourage or require a verified ORCiD® for contributions such as reviewing, editing, or authoring.

By linking openness to verified identity, opensci.id enables new models of trusted collaboration, and enables an identity-centric research integrity infrastructure for information exchange between journal, peer-review platforms, and institutional research integrity offices. By providing assurance that contributors are who they claim to be, risks of identity fraud or covert influence are reduced, while researchers retain the ability to participate in global, open research workflows without restrictive gatekeeping. Moreover, opensci.id embeds user-controlled privacy safeguards, allowing researchers to disclose only the minimum necessary information to meet compliance requirements. This approach aligns security with the principles of transparency and inclusivity rather than setting them in opposition.

(ORCiD® Is a registered trademark of ORCID Inc., Delaware. The authors are independent from ORCID)

P.37

Predicting Study Reproducibility by Automated Analysis of Its Epistemic Context

Dr. Daniele Fanelli[1], *Dr. Assemgul Kozhabeck*[1]
[1]*Department of Research Methods and Practice, School of Social Sciences, Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom*

Objective
This talk will present a new empirical methodology that may help researchers forecast the results of a replication study. In particular, it shall report on empirical results that are partially available at the time of submitting this abstract, assessing to what extent the reproducibility of a finding correlates with parameters measuring the complexity of its methods and the cognitive "hardness" (level of consensus and maturity) of the literature it cites.

Methods
We re-analysed all data that were compiled by the Brasilian Reproducibility Initiative (BRI, N=60) and the Open Science Framework Replicability Challenge (OSF, N=1711). For each original study, we retrieved the PDF of the publication and the full bibliographic records of all its cited references. To measure the methodological complexity, we extracted from its full-text the description of the study's methods, converted it into a knowledge graph using a Large Language Model, and measured the complexity and other properties of the resulting graph. To measure the cognitive "hardness" of each study's field, we measured various properties of the literature it cited, including the structure of the co-reference network of this literature, which is the most direct measure of the level of scientific consensus within that literature.

Results
Results on the BRI data show that several of the measures listed above correlate significantly with the replication validity and the replication success of studies. Analyses of the OSF data, still in progress at the time of submitting this abstract, show similarly promising results. As part of the OSF replicability challenge, we shall pre-register predictions on new data, and the talk will report on results of all these tests.

Conclusion
Results available to date suggest that the replicability and reproduciblity of a study can be significantly predicted by properties of the study's methods and field, the measurement of which can be largely automated. Unlike Prediction Markets and Deep learning methods, this approach to forecasting reproducibility is explainable and theoretically meaningful.

P.39

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees and the Challenges of Evaluating Animal Research Proposals

Mr. Stephen Farghali[1]
[1]*Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, Washington, USA*

The responsibility of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs) for reviewing proposed experiments, particularly with regard to adherence to legal and ethical mandates, can be a challenging task. This review seeks to understand factors that may limit the effectiveness of IACUCs and identify possible solutions.

This editorial review summarizes scientific literature describing the challenges faced by U.S. IACUCs and those who rely on them and describes actions that may improve their functioning.

Apart from what may be a sizable workload and the need to satisfy applicable regulations, committees have fundamental structural challenges and limitations. Under U.S. law, there is no requirement that committee members have expertise in the research areas under review or in methods that could replace animal use, nor could expertise in such vast technical areas be expected, in contrast with the review process of many scientific journals in which experts in the conditions being studied critique the choice of subjects and methods used. Although investigators are expected to consider alternatives to procedures that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress, they are not required to use them. While investigators must assure committee members that studies do not duplicate other research, committee members are not required to verify this. Consideration of alternatives to painful procedures is not required at all for experiments on animals not covered by the Animal Welfare Act. The majority of U.S. research institutions now allow research proposals to be approved using a system called Designated Member Review, without full committee consideration. In other countries, requirements differ considerably. In the European Union, for example, investigators must complete a harm-benefit analysis and must use alternatives, not simply consider them.

The review process may be improved by requiring searches for nonanimal methods regardless of species, favoring alternatives based on human biology, improving the education of committee members and investigators, using reviewers with subject matter expertise, and minimizing conflicts of interest. Because of the limitations of the review process, funding institutions and scientific journals should not use IACUC approval of submissions as evidence of adherence to ethical guidelines beyond those legally required.

P.41

Are We Addressing Complaints About Animal Care Appropriately?

Dr. Misty Fish[1]
[1]*Curtin University, Bentley, Australia*

The Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes (8th Edition 2013) (the Animal Code) recognises that institutions may receive complaints about the care and use of animals used for scientific purposes. It acknowledges that complaints may relate to activities, persons, the Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) (or individual members) and governance officials. In order to address such complaints, institutions must have appropriate procedures in place for dealing with these complaints.

At times, institutions develop standard operating procedures (or similar) that allow AECs to receive, and deal with, complaints about non-compliances with the Animal Code, particularly where complaints relate to activities that have the potential to adversely affect animal wellbeing, and where whether activities which have AEC approval are conducted in accordance with the approval. However, if the complaint made also raises the possibility of 'research misconduct' as described in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 (the Research Code), the complaint should be handled in accordance with procedures specified in the Research Code.

When thinking about the connection between potential non-compliances under the Animal Code and complaints that may raise the possibility of research misconduct under the Research Code, are AECs adequately equipped to decide non-compliances, and/or potential breaches, and do AEC members understand the assessment and investigation principles and how to ensure procedural fairness is afforded to those who may be impacted by the complaint.

The presenter has conducted a brief desktop review of several Australian institutions policy and procedural documents relating to non-compliances and how it may intersect with the Research Code. The presentation will highlight potential issues associated with AECs determining non-compliances, consider whether it is clear at what point matters should be referred to Research Integrity Offices for appropriate consideration under the Research Code, and open conversation about whether the handling of complaints in this area could be improved to ensure stronger compliance with, and emphasis on, the importance of the responsible conduct of research.

P.43

A New Honey Trap: Recommended Reviewers

Mrs Kim Eggleton[1], ***Miss Lauren Flintoft***[1], ***Dr Graham Stinton***[1]
[1]*IOP Publishing, Bristol, United Kingdom*

For decades journals have offered authors the opportunity to suggest reviewers, to help identify the most appropriate people to perform peer review. However it is well established that author recommended reviewers (ARRs) carry a higher risk of bias and conflicts of interest (1, 2). As a result, some Publishers have stopped allowing ARRs altogether (3).
At IOP Publishing we have not yet made that move, because these optional fields are surprisingly useful, but not for the reason everyone thinks. We've noticed certain names appearing again and again as recommended reviewers – to the extent that we now consider the appearance of some of these names a "red flag" for a potential unethical submission.
It's well known that papermills are manipulating the peer review process by infiltrating editorial teams, often as guest editors (4, 5). However we also suspect papermills are using either real or fake reviewer accounts to rubber-stamp their own milled submissions. A busy or automated (!) Editor would be happy to see someone with a strong reviewing history - but what if they're being used so frequently for a reason?
We have a policy at IOP Publishing amongst our professional Editors that ARRs are only to be used in exceptional circumstances, and then only when combined with another, fully independent, reviewer report. So why allow suggestions at all? Because if these authors are recommending someone we know or suspect is associated with a papermill, we can treat that submission with increased scrutiny and caution.
This poster will talk through the challenge and use some (anonymised) real-life examples for context. It is hoped this will stimulate debate about the efficacy of this signal and if or how it should be used.

[1] Liang, Y. (2018). Learned Publishing, 31(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1166
[2] Teixeira da Silva, J. A., & Al-Khatib, A. (2018). Science and Engineering Ethics, 24(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-016-9842-6
[3] SAGE Publishing. (n.d.). What are the best practices for selecting reviewers? SAGE Journals Solutions. https://journalssolutions.sagepub.com/support/solutions/articles/7000089408-what-are-the-best-practices-for-selecting-reviewers
[4] Else, H. (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-03035-y
[5] Trapp, J. (2019, December 27). 'Disbelief': Researchers, watch out for this new scam involving journal special issues. Retraction Watch.

P.45

Reuse of Original Review Text in Updated Systematic Reviews

Mrs. Tove Faber Frandsen[1], *Dr. Mette Eriksen*
[1]*University Of Southern Denmark, Kolding, Denmark*

Objective
The rise of plagiarism detection software in scientific journals has intensified the debate on text recycling (1), with opinions being divided on the ethics of text reuse in reviews. Some consider reviews a class of legitimate duplication (2) as it saves time and allow for the updated review to build directly on the original review. Cochrane therefore allows reviewers to reuse text of original reviews in updated reviews (3) but in many cases plagiarism software is used to detect text reuse in all submitted manuscripts. This study aims to analyze the extent of text reuse between original and updated reviews and thereby contribute to the discussion of the ethics of text reuse.

Methods
The methods involve comparing text overlaps using a sample of 111 Cochrane systematic reviews pairs of original and updated reviews. All review texts were collected and the extent of overlap are being analyzed using standard plagiarism detection software. Similarities between updated reviews and original reviews will be analyzed and compared to overlaps between random Cochrane reviews. We are focusing on whether the overlap between the original and the updated review is greater than the overlap caused by using similar methodological descriptions in all Cochrane reviews.

Results
The review pairs are already collected, and the analyses are currently being carried out. The results will consist of mean overlap scores between unrelated Cochrane reviews as well as pairs of updated and original Cochrane reviews.

Conclusion
As scientific literature grows, moral conventions and policies surrounding publishing may lag behind. This study can contribute to this discussion by exploring if text reuse is widespread in updated reviews and therefore editorial policies should take this into consideration specifically.

References
1. Higgins JR, Lin F-C, Evans JP. Plagiarism in submitted manuscripts: incidence, characteristics and optimization of screening—case study in a major specialty medical journal. Research integrity and peer review. 2016;1:1-8.
2. Couzin-Frankel J. Repetition Is Not Duplication. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2009.
3. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews: editorial policies [Available from: https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/editorial-policies#plagiarism.

P.47

Professionalization in Integrity, Best Practices, and Innovation in Scientific Publishing: ABEC Brazil's Experience with the ABEC Education Program

Prof. Edna Frasson De Souza Montero[1,2], *Dr. Sílvia Galleti*[1,3], *Full Professor Sigmar de Mello Rode*[1,4]
[1]Associação Brasileira de Editores Científicos - ABEC Brasil, São Paulo, Brazil, [2]Associate Professor at Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil, [3]Researcher at the Instituto Biológico, São Paulo, Brasil, [4]Full Professor - Universidade Estadual Paulista, São José dos Campos, Brasil

Introduction & Aim
Founded in 1985, the Brazilian Association of Scientific Editors (ABEC Brasil) has established itself as the leading national forum dedicated to promoting good practices, ethics, integrity, and innovation in scientific publishing. Its work has strengthened the professionalization of editors and expanded the integration of Brazilian journals into international networks and initiatives.

Methods
Currently, ABEC Brasil has 1,411 members, 1,089 associated journals, 62 journal portals, and several institutional collaborations. One of its main training tools is ABEC Educação, a program aimed at editors, authors, reviewers, and librarians. The initiative offers training in a flexible and modular format, enabling participants to obtain ABEC Brasil Scientific Editor Certification.
The certification is structured in three knowledge tracks, which organize the courses according to the type of activity performed in scientific publishing. To obtain certification, participants must complete at least one course from each track, although it is also possible to take them independently.

Results & Conclusion
The editorial management track includes courses on editorial management (60 hours), scientific editorial policy (60 hours), open science (60 hours), and scientific communication (40 hours). The scientific editorial evaluation track covers the training of article reviewers (60 hours), journal indexers (40 hours), and institutional support for the editorial department (10 hours). The editorial tools and technologies track comprises courses on anti-plagiarism resources (30 hours), DOI (20 hours), digital preservation (20 hours), publishing in OJS 3.3 LTS (40 hours), and the use of artificial intelligence in scientific publishing (40 hours).
Conceived in 2020 and effectively launched in 2022, with the opening of enrollment for the first course, ABEC Educação currently has 1,280 enrolled students, 1,188 of whom have completed at least one course. To obtain certification, participants must complete 360 hours, of which up to 60 can be validated via Recognition of Knowledge and Skills (RSC).
This certification represents more than technical training: it constitutes a commitment to integrity, professional qualification, and responsible innovation in Brazilian scientific publishing, reaffirming ABEC Brasil's role in consolidating an ethical, transparent, and technologically up-to-date publishing culture, contributing to the strengthening and international visibility of the country's scientific journals.

P.49

Building an Institutional Culture of Academic and Research Integrity: The PUCIAC-CUCS Program and the CIAC-CUCS Committee

*Dr. Irene Cordova Jimenez[2], **Dr. Bernardo Garcia Camino**[1]*
[1]Universidad Autonoma de Queretaro, Queretaro, Mexico, [2]Centro Universitario de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

Background
Universities worldwide face sophisticated forms of academic misconduct and research wrongdoing amplified by digital tools and generative AI. At the University of Guadalajara's Health Sciences Center (CUCS), a comprehensive diagnosis revealed persistent gaps in prevention, education, case management, and whistleblower protection despite existing rules.

Objective
To design and implement a dual, campus-wide strategy that strengthens integrity as a cultural ecosystem: (1) the University Program for a Culture of Academic and Scientific Integrity (PUCIAC-CUCS), and (2) the Academic and Scientific Integrity Committee (CIAC-CUCS), a collegial, technical body to receive, analyze, and adjudicate cases with due process.

Methods/Approach
We propose a three-phase, evidence-informed roadmap—Initiation (0–6 months), Institutionalization (6–18), and Consolidation (18–36)—combining formative, preventive, restorative, and (when needed) sanctioning measures. Key components include mandatory training, transparent authorship/AI-use disclosure, data-management norms, protection of whistleblowers, and coordinated governance with existing ethics and oversight offices. Indicators track training coverage, case throughput, perceptions of ethical climate, and policy adoption.
Setting/Scale. CUCS hosts >20,000 students, 1,689 academics, 354 members of the National Researchers System, and 330 PRODEP-recognized faculty—an enabling context to embed integrity across teaching, assessment, research, and dissemination.

Results/Expected Outcomes
Short-term: clear procedures, confidential reporting channels, and improved ethical literacy. Mid-term: reduced questionable practices (e.g., plagiarism, ghost authorship, undisclosed AI use), strengthened transparency, and fair authorship credit. Long-term: a resilient integrity culture aligned with international standards (values, open science, accountability), improved trust, and sustainable governance.

Conclusions/Implications
Moving from rule-centric control to culture-building requires aligned structures, incentives, and education. The PUCIAC-CUCS/CIAC-CUCS model offers a scalable blueprint for health-sciences campuses to respond to emerging risks—especially those posed by AI—while safeguarding due process, equity, and research reliability.

P.51

This Is What You Want... This Is What You Get: Disparities Between How Researchers Are Assessed and How They Want To Be

Dr. Ed Gerstner[1], *Una Farr*[1], *Ms. Kaia Motter*[1]
[1]*Springer Nature, London, United Kingdom*

The way research is evaluated can significantly influence the behaviours, values, and practices of researchers, potentially undermining research integrity. But how do researchers themselves feel about how they are assessed and how do they want to be assessed? We carried out a survey of over six-and-a-half thousand researchers worldwide to find out.

The results suggest that while they recognise the value of quantitative metrics such as papers and citations in the assessment of research, the majority of respondents want these to be balanced against the many other contributions they make.

Globally, two-thirds of respondents said they felt their contributions to the public good or to improving the research environment (including ethics, research integrity and diversity) should be considered in the assessment of them and their research. But fewer than a third said that they were.

In North America, 45% of respondents said they felt that they should be recognised for open science practices, but despite the numerous mandates on open access and open data, fewer than 10% told us such practices were included in research assessment. In Europe, almost half the respondents said they felt their contribution to solving global challenges should be considered in their assessment but fewer than a fifth said that it did.

In contrast, respondents from Africa, Latin America and Asia were more likely to report that their contributions to aspects other than publications were part of their research assessment than those from Europe or North America. Respondents from Africa were more than twice as likely to report that their contributions to the research environment are considered as respondents from Europe.

In this talk, we'll give an overview of the disparities, including regional variations, between what researchers want and what researchers get when it comes to research assessment. And we'll identify some of the areas where reform to research assessment could have the greatest impact in improving the state of research. Through this, we hope to support efforts to develop assessment frameworks that reflect the values of researchers and foster a global research culture that is robust, inclusive, and has integrity at its heart.

P.53

Evidence Over Opinion: What UK Research Integrity Data Really Tells Us

Prof. Rachael Gooberman-Hill[1,2], ***Mrs Louise Mrs Dunlop***[1,4], *Mrs. Rebecca Mrs Veitch*[3], *Professor Maria Delgado*[1,5], *Dr. Jane Dr Alfred*[1,6]

[1]*UK Committee on Research Integrity, United Kingdom,* [2]*University of Bristol, United Kingdom,* [3]*UK Research and Innovation, United Kingdom,* [4]*Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom,* [5]*The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London, United Kingdom,* [6]*Catalyst Editorial, United Kingdom*

While commentators may express a wide range of views about the state of research integrity, it is vital that commentaries and policies are based on best available evidence. If researchers are expected to adhere to robust, evidence-based practice then it seems only fair that research policy-makers and leaders are afforded the courtesy of being given access to the best available information to underpin their decisions.

As part of its establishment in 2022, the UK Committee on Research Integrity was tasked by government with publishing an annual statement on the state of research integrity in the UK. To deliver this, the Committee has been identifying, collating and developing evidence about the state of UK research integrity, in the context of an understanding that much research is international and thrives on cross-border collaboration.

This presentation will describe and reflect on what four years of evidence gathering have told us about efforts to support, and maintain, high integrity. The presentation will describe findings relating to:

- analyses of over 500 institutional annual statements of research integrity, including from higher education and government
- work to identify factors that enable or inhibit research integrity practice
- analyses of data relating to published research and related indicators
- empirical and desk-based research and consultation into structures that enable the investigation of research misconduct allegations

As a whole, the body of evidence is both a snapshot of research integrity now and in recent years, with international comparators and examples from a range of sectors. Importantly, the evidence provides information about areas of strength, models of good practice, and indicates where improvements are likely to enhance research integrity. The findings have helped the UK understand the local context for current international challenges, such as papermills, and how evidence from the UK can address emerging issues, including the use of generative-AI in research practice.

This work has been made possible through collaboration with, and feedback from, a diverse range of people working across the research system. The presentation will conclude by highlighting how collaboration grounded in evidence is fundamental to achieving meaningful and lasting improvements in research integrity.

P.55

AI-assisted Rigor Assessment in Published Biomedical Research: A Scoping Review of Variability in Definitions and Generalizability

Mr. Evan Guerra[1], *Joe Menke*[1], *Dr. COLBY VORLAND*[2], *Evan Mayo-Wilson*[3], *Halil Kilicoglu*[1]
[1]*University Of Illinois Urbana - Champaign, School of Information Sciences, Champaign, USA,* [2]*Indiana University, School of Public Health, Bloomington, USA,* [3]*University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Global Public Health, Chapel Hill, USA*

Objective
Evaluating methodological rigor in biomedical publications is essential for evidence synthesis, but it is time-intensive and requires specialized expertise. While automated rigor classification systems have existed since the early 2000s, prior research shows that they often fail to generalize across publication years, domains, and study designs. Our work examines how AI-based models/tools define and detect methodological rigor, evaluates their performance across these dimensions, and aims to build more robust and generalizable models to support evidence synthesis.

Methods
We are conducting a scoping review of peer-reviewed publications (2005-2025) that use AI methods to make predictions about methodological rigor (defined as appropriateness of the methods for addressing the research question, and whether the conclusions align with what those methods can support). We comprehensively search PubMed, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, and the ACL Anthology. From the included studies, we extract information on how 'rigor' is defined and operationalized (i.e., what criteria are used to determine rigor), datasets used for model development and validation, and AI methods applied. Our review will map similarities and differences across approaches to defining and evaluating rigor, and assess the feasibility of developing a generalizable AI framework for assessing rigor across study designs, domains, and publication years.

Results
Preliminary observations indicate substantial variation in terminology. Terms such as scientific rigor, methodological rigor, scientific soundness, and high-quality studies are used interchangeably with inconsistent definitions. Our preliminary work focused on how methodological rigor was operationalized in the Clinical Hedges dataset (Wilczynski et al., 2005), which incorporates literature from 2000-2001 with design-specific criteria, and a recent dataset spanning 2000-2020 and using Cochrane systematic review inclusion as rigor criteria (Afzal et al., 2020). A model trained on the Clinical Hedges dataset achieved 0.85 F1 score on its in-domain test set but only 0.45 F1 on the Cochrane-based dataset, indicating limited generalizability.

Conclusion
This work in progress highlights the variability in how scientific rigor is defined and implemented in AI models, with preliminary evidence suggesting limited cross-domain and temporal generalizability. Our full scoping review, to be presented at the meeting, will inform the development of more generalizable frameworks for automated rigor assessment.

P.57

The Development of a Tool (INSPECT-IPD) to Identify Problematic Randomised Controlled Trials When Individual Participant Data Are Available

Mr. Calvin Heal[1], *Lisa Bero*[2], *Mr. Jamie Kirkham*[1], *Dr Jack Wilkinson*[1]
[1]*Centre for Biostatistics, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK., Manchester, United Kingdom,* [2]*University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Colorado, USA, Aurora, United States of America*

Objective
Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) investigate whether interventions are safe and effective. However, some RCTs contain false data, and others may not have taken place at all. False data may result from misconduct (including fabricating or falsifying data) or honest errors. The INSPECT-SR tool assesses the trustworthiness of RCTs in systematic reviews of healthcare-related interventions. By applying a series of checks based on study publications and related documentation, the user comes to a judgement on the 'trustworthiness' of the study. Where individual participant data (IPD) can be obtained, a more thorough assessment of trustworthiness is possible. For example, Carlisle assessed 526 RCTs submitted to the journal Anaesthesia. For trials without IPD available, he detected false data in 2%, classifying 1% as critically flawed. For trials with IPD, he detected false data in 44% and classified 26% as critically flawed. This suggests that the availability of IPD improves the ability to detect fake data. Consequently, INSPECT-SR recommends obtaining IPD to resolve uncertainties, though there is no consensus on appropriate methods for forensic analysis of raw data. Our aim is to evaluate IPD checks to establish which are worthwhile, and how they can be implemented in a new tool, INSPECT-IPD (INveStigating ProblEmatic Clinical Trials with Individual Participant Data).

Methods
INSPECT-IPD will be developed using five stages: (1) compiling IPD trustworthiness checks, (2) evaluating usefulness and interpretability of checks on trustworthy and untrustworthy datasets, (3) a Delphi survey to determine which checks are supported by expert consensus, (4) consensus meetings to select checks for the draft tool and (5) prospective testing of the draft tool in a) the production of systematic reviews, and b) the journal process for RCT submissions, leading to refinement based on user feedback.

Results
We will present an overview of the project, deliver interim results, and provide information about how to participate in tool development.

Conclusion
INSPECT-IPD will serve as a vital adjunct to INSPECT-SR in cases where IPD is available, allowing assessors to make more accurate judgements about the authenticity of RCTs.

P.59

Trust: Implications for Research Integrity

Ms. Patricia Henley[1]
[1]*London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom*

Objective
Trust is at the heart of higher education; it gives universities their credibility. Trust operates at many levels; from the interactions between colleagues and students, to trust in institutional leadership, through to societal trust in the sector. The aim of this presentation is to explore the perception of trust and its impact on the development of research integrity policies.

Methods
A purposive sampling strategy was employed to conduct semi-structured interviews with 21 academic staff who could provide insights into institutional trust dynamics. The project used the Institutional Theory of Generalised Trust as the theoretical framework that underpins the analyses.

Results
Research staff need to be trusted in order to effectively undertake their roles; this is regarded as a crucial element in a positive research culture within the university. The research community greatly appreciate the trust bestowed upon them, and are cognizant that this must not be taken for granted. Whilst researchers stated that they endeavour to conduct their research within the norms of integrity, it is recognised that this comes at a risk as not all researchers share the same integrity standards.

Inter-organisational and intra-organisational trust is fundamental to how research is conducted as this is ultimately a human endeavour. Clinical trials, in particular, seem to be built on a foundation of mistrust, with the endless layers of quality control, quality assurance and even inspections, ensuring that regulatory requirements are met. Leaders should consider the importance of maintaining trust within their research teams when developing new research integrity policies.

Conclusion
By understanding the importance of trust, both in how the public views the institution and how staff feel within the institution, we can develop processes to assure the quality and integrity of the research, without creating a culture of mistrust. The session will emphasise the importance of the perception of trust within the research community, and describe how research integrity processes should refocus from a position of mistrust to one of trust.

P.61

A Framework for Ethical Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence to Generate Computer Source Code for Research Data Analysis

Prof. Joshua Ho[1]
[1]*The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

Writing computer code to perform data analysis is an increasingly important task in many research projects that requires manipulation, visualisation, and statistical analysis of potentially large and complex data sets – collectively known as research analysis tasks. Modern generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools, such as ChatGPT, can be used to generate computer code snippets for research analysis tasks. Ensuring the trustworthiness of these AI generated code is critical as it contributes to the veracity of the research outcome. Current guidelines on GenAI use for research analysis is often limited, and not specific. In this study, I review and summary the current literature and guidelines on ethical use of GenAI to generate computer code for research analysis tasks. Drawing on core principles on software verification and validation, I propose a framework that emphasises transparency and testing: the 2T principle. In terms of transparency, all code and record of how the code were generated should be managed and stored such that they can be inspected and reproduced by human or other AI agents. In terms of testing, all code and the process that generated the code should be subjected to an adequate amount of testing to ensure the correctness of the computational output after execution of the code. I will provide examples of how these may be implemented in real life research settings, and how this process may be integrated into a good research data management process.

P.63

Verifying Claims in Peer Reviews: Toward Grounded, Transparent Feedback

*Dr. Negar Arabzadeh[1], Sajad Ebrahimi[1], Soroosh Sadeghian[1], Ali Ghorbanpour[1], **Dr. Mohammad Hosseini**[1], Alireza Daqiq[1], Hai Son Le[1], Mahdi Bashari[1], Dr Ebrahim Bagheri[1]*
[1]Reviewerly, Toronto, CANADA

Objective
Peer review is intended to provide constructive and evidence-based feedback, yet reviewers often include claims that are subjective, rhetorical, or only weakly grounded in the submitted work. Such claims create difficulties for authors crafting rebuttals, reviewers aiming to refine their own reports, and editors or organizers tasked with judging review reliability. This study investigates whether large language models (LLMs), combined with information retrieval systems, can assess the extent to which peer review claims are supported by the manuscript itself.

Methods
We designed a modular pipeline for evaluating grounding in peer reviews. The pipeline consists of three steps: (i) extracting verifiable claims from review text, (ii) retrieving relevant passages from the submitted manuscript, and (iii) determining whether each claim is entailed, contradicted, or left unresolved by the evidence. To benchmark this approach, we used two forms of supervision: (a) human-annotated datasets of review–paper pairs labeled for claim support, and (b) naturally occurring interactions from online peer review platforms, where rebuttals and reviewer revisions provide implicit feedback on which claims were challenged or defended. We compared multiple pipeline configurations, varying the claim extraction, retrieval, and entailment verification modules.

Results
Our evaluation demonstrates that claim verification is feasible at scale but remains challenging in practice. We applied our pipeline to peer reviews from large computer science venues such as NeurIPS and ICLR, showing that automated systems can fact-check review claims against manuscripts to a meaningful degree. However, performance depends strongly on pipeline design: different module combinations yield distinct trade-offs between accuracy, scalability, and responsiveness. These trade-offs are particularly critical for potential real-time deployment, where reliability and efficiency must be balanced. Furthermore, while correlations with human annotations and author–reviewer interaction signals vary, hybrid systems that combine LLM verification with explicit IR-based evidence produce the most consistent results.

Conclusion
Automated tools for verifying whether reviewer claims are supported by manuscripts can improve transparency and reliability in peer review. Such systems would assist authors in rebuttals, support reviewers in refining feedback, and provide editors scalable mechanisms for monitoring review quality. While current LLM-based pipelines show promise, careful design is needed to balance accuracy and scalability.

P.65

Storytelling for Responsible Research in a Changing World

Dr. Giulia Inguaggiato[1], *Dr Natalie Evans*[1]
[1]*Amsterdam Umc, Amsterdam, Netherlands*

In the context of urgent global challenges such as the climate crisis and the rising of social and political threats to science, it is crucial for researchers to reflect on their role in today's global environment. Preserving the quality and integrity of research requires not only adherence to formal principles, but also spaces for reflection that allow researchers to consider their responsibilities and positionalities in the face of social and ecological challenges. In response to these challenges, within The Embassy of Good Science, this initiative aims to use storytelling and podcasting to create spaces for self-reflection to foster researchers into cultivating moral awareness and the ability to use creativity and empathy to envision possibilities for action in complex situations.
Instead of emphasizing possible mistakes or the enforcement of rules, the focus of this initiative lies in highlighting and disseminating exemplary stories that may include mistakes but that can offer actionable, emotionally relatable, and inspirational lessons. This initiative encourages researchers to share their experiences of both successes and failures through storytelling, thereby fostering openness and dialogue. Storytelling allows complex issues to be explored in depth; by enabling emotional engagement and reflection on what these emotions reveal about researchers' values and commitments, stories help in linking research practice with its ethical dimensions. Because of this, stories hold a highly educational value. Moreover, by placing the experience of doing research at the center of inquiry, storytelling provides a valuable tool for reflecting on positionality, power, and responsibility and allows for connection and shared understanding among researchers who may face similar experiences.
These stories, created with and by researchers across different fields and nationalities and shared through podcasting via The Embassy of Good Science, aim to inspire, educate and guide others with actionable insights. By showing how individuals have faced and learned from facing difficulties and doubts, this initiative aims to highlight the human side of research, promote good practices, and strengthen the awareness of the societal and environmental impact of research.

P.67

Non-Publication and Discontinuation of Registered Observational Studies of Interventions

Mrs. Cecilie Jespersen[1,2], *Dr. Zexing Song*[3], *Dr. An-Wen Chan*[3,4], *Dr. Asbjørn Hróbjartsson*[1,2]
[1]*Centre of Evidence-Based Medicine Odense and Cochrane Denmark, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark,* [2]*Open Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark,* [3]*Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada,* [4]*Department of Medicine, Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Canada*

Objective
Non-publication and premature discontinuation of studies are major contributors to research waste among RCTs, but the extent remains unclear among observational studies. We aimed to estimate the prevalence of non-publication and discontinuation of controlled cohort studies of interventions. Secondary aims were to describe the reasons for discontinuation and determine the association between study characteristics and time to publication.

Methods
We conducted a meta-epidemiological study of cohort studies with a control group, investigating the effects of health-related interventions, registered on ClinicalTrials.gov within one month of their listed study start date (2014–2016). We excluded ongoing studies, studies that never started, and records not representing original research projects. From January to December 2024, we screened records of studies marked as complete, and from January to April 2025, we screened discontinued studies. Study publications were identified through online searches and contacting authors via email. Complete publication required the public availability of the main study results. Author-reported reasons for discontinuation were extracted from ClinicalTrials.gov and, if missing, by contacting authors. Characteristics were extracted from registry records and results publications by a pair of reviewers. Data extraction is still ongoing, expected to be finalized by January 2026. Statistical analyses: multivariable logistic regression to identify factors associated with publication, and Cox regression to analyze time to publication.

Results
We screened 16,558 registry records labelled as observational studies and included 399 records of cohort studies of interventions. Studies were grouped based on the listed status on ClinicalTrials.gov: 278 were completed studies (status: complete or unknown with published results) and 121 were discontinued (status: withdrawn, terminated, suspended or unknown without published results). Of completed studies, 179 were published (publication rate 64%), while only 10 of 121 discontinued studies were published (publication rate 8%). Final results will be available for presentation at the conference, including time to publication stratified by funder and statistical significance of the main results.

Conclusion
Our preliminary findings reveal that a third of registered cohort studies of interventions were discontinued prematurely, representing a substantial source of research waste. The frequent non-publication of completed studies shows that reporting bias is a considerable concern in these studies.

P.69

Methodological Innovations in Research Ethics Review: Beyond Compliance

*Dr. Marjo Rauhala[1], **Prof. Carl Walter Matthias Kaiser**[2,3], Prof. Ioannis Manos[4], Dr. Tina Garani-Papadatos[5], Dr. Jonas Pfister[1], Mrs. Konstantina Giouvanopoulou[6], Dr. Xenia Ziouvelou[6], Dr. Vasiliki Mollaki[6]*
[1]Technische Universität Wien (TU Wien), Vienna, Austria, [2]Norwegian Institute for Sustainability Research, Kråkerøy, Norway, [3]University of Bergen, SVT, Bergen, Norway, [4]University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki, Greece, [5]University of West Attica, Athens, Greece, [6]Institute of Informatics and Telecommunications, National Centre for Scientific Research "Demokritos", Athens, Greece

Research ethics committees (RECs) play a critical role in ensuring the dignity, integrity, and safety of research participants, thereby strengthening public trust in scientific endeavours.
Such committees operate independently, usually without direct interaction with researchers submitting their proposals for ethical review. Contact between RECs and researchers is often limited to submission forms, written requests for clarification, and approvals. In their applications, researchers are expected to identify and address relevant ethical concerns and risks before starting their research, thereby focusing, ex ante, on those matters that can be reasonably anticipated.
Novel challenges arising from new technologies and emerging research formats may remain unaddressed in this process. Moreover, with a one-time approval, ethical concerns that emerge during the research may remain overlooked. The potential of RECs to improve the quality of research is often overshadowed by researchers' perception of an over-bureaucratized procedure or a hurdle between their ambition and "real work."
Addressing these limitations, the EU-funded CHANGER project develops novel methods of research ethics review to tackle both persistent and new challenges related to technological innovation and evolving research practices. These methods cover the entire lifecycle of complex projects and apply across the full range of research fields, from technology and medicine to the social sciences and humanities.
This presentation focuses on two of the project's novel methods – "consultative research ethics review" and "narrative-based ethical scenario building." It highlights how these methods expand ethics review beyond procedural compliance toward continuous, collaborative ethical reflection. The methods were tested in workshops across six European countries, involving over one hundred participants with expertise in research ethics review.
The pilot workshops received overwhelmingly positive responses, underscoring the need for more innovative and diverse approaches to ethics review. They showed that collaboration between researchers and ethics committees sustains ethical reflection, adapts effectively across institutional and national settings, and empowers researchers to maintain ethical awareness throughout the project lifecycle.
Building on this evidence, the presentation demonstrates how the CHANGER methods transform ethics review into a reflexive and participatory process that links ethical oversight with research integrity and positions it as a living, dialogical practice of responsible research.

P.71

Voices from the Community to Mitigate Pre-Engagement Research Harms

Mrs. Kari Davenport[1], ***Ms. Jennifer Pitt***[2], ***Helena Katz***[3], ***Dr. Sunila Kalkar***[4]
[1]The Western Arctic Marine Training Centre, Hay River, Canada, [2]University of British Columbia, Registered Nurse, Stanton Hospital, NWT, [3]Fort Smith, NWT, [4]Aurora College, Fort Smith, NWT,

This oral presentation highlights a gap in current Canadian research integrity oversight to mitigate harms inflicted during pre-engagement and preliminary research activities that fall outside formal Research Ethics Board oversight.

We demonstrate how well-intentioned researchers working within established ethical guidelines can inadvertently cause harm during research development. Our multi-sectoral group of community leaders, lived-experience experts, and ethics professionals, present a real-life case study from the Northwest Territories, where communities dealing with 2023 post-wildfire trauma were engaged. These interactions failed to consider the vulnerable state of the population, exacerbating distress because of a lack of contextual awareness, and exposed participants to re-traumatization.

We assert that research integrity is more than adherence to regulation, but about an ongoing responsibility to understand the unique context of individuals and communities, to embed culturally safe and accessible practices, focusing on ensuring good relations with land, water, animals, and one another and to build relationships of trust before any data collection.

Authentic research integrity requires non-Indigenous researchers to recognize the historical and ongoing impacts of colonization and actively work to dismantle the power imbalances. This requires establishing trust, taking the time required to build trusting relationships, and aligning research goals with the community's priorities. The goal, as called out in the National Inuit Strategy on Research (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2018), must be to end the exploitative relationship where researchers advance their own careers by merely passing through communities.

We call on the academic community to move toward an expanded, decolonized definition of research integrity that prioritizes dignity, contextual awareness, and harm mitigation during all stages of research engagement, ensuring that community voices lead the research agenda.

References:

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2018). A National Inuit Strategy on Research.

O'Brien JM, Blais N, Butler C, White N, Bustead A, Figler C, et al. (2024). Ten "simple" rules for non-Indigenous researchers engaging Indigenous communities in Arctic research. PLoS Comput Biol 20(6): e1012093.

Wong, C., Ballegooyen, K., Ignace, L., Johnson, M. J., & Swanson, H. (2020). Towards reconciliation: 10 calls to action to natural scientists working in Canada. FACETS, 5(1), 769–783.

P.75

It Takes (Much) More Than Two to Tango: A Nation-Wide Effort to Institutionalise Open Science and Research Integrity in Greece

Dr. Panagiotis Kavouras[1,2], *Mrs. Lia Ollandezou*[2]
[1]*Centre for Medical Ethics, Institute of Health and Society, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Norway,*
[2]*HEAL-Link Office, Library & Information Center, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Athens*

The Hellenic Academic Libraries Link (HEAL-Link, www.heal-link.gr/) is a non-profit public organization, funded by the Ministry of Education, Religious Affairs and Sports of Greece. Its main responsibilities are to provide access to the Greek Academic community to closed access scientific publications and to negotiate transformative agreements with scientific publishing houses – with a provision for covering the costs of Open Access (OA) publications of researchers affiliated to Greek Universities and research centers. During the last years HEAL-Link is transcending its role as the Greek organisation that promotes scholarly communication and funds OA, by its trailblasing activities related to creating an open data infrastructure for Greek researchers (HARDMIN, hardmin.heal-link.gr/en/), promoting Research Integrity (RI), developing institutional best practices on research assessment, supporting the development of a repository of scientific publications in the Greek Language, as well as by developing a national policy on Open Science (OS). HEAL-Link's initiative on RI was launched in February 2025 with the delivery of seminars on responsible Open Science and Research Integrity to the majority of Greek Universities. At the time of writing, 24 seminars have been delivered to 16 Greek Universities, engaging more than 800 members of the Greek Academic community, while the planning for the 2025-2026 Academic year is under way. This is the first, centrally coordinated nation-wide effort that has been launched in Greece, to sensitise on topics that are related to supporting the production of reliable research results. In this work, we report the positive spillover effects of HEAL-Link's manifold activities on the promotion of RI in Greece. More specifically, we reflect on the experiences gained during the first round of seminars and during HEAL-Link's participation at the Hellenic Universities Rector's Conference, in the context of the efforts to promote a national policy on OS. It is evident that policies on OS and RI in Greece can be more effectively pursued in combination, rather as separate initiatives. This is, most possibly, because in this way such policies are perceived as more pertinent by a more inclusive group of research-related stakeholders and the real stakes of the lack of such policies become more evident.

P.77

The Plaque of Misconduct: Retractions in Periodontitis-Related Research

Dr. Carla Brigitte Susan Kohl[1], *Dr. Cornelia Wolf-Brandstetter*[2,3], *Prof. Clovis Mariano Faggion Jr*[1]
[1]*Department of Periodontology and Operative Dentistry, University Hospital Münster, Germany, Münster, Germany,* [2]*International Medical College (IMC) of the University Duisburg-Essen, Schorlemer Straße 26, 48143 Münster, Germany, Münster, Germany,* [3]*Max Bergmann Center of Biomaterials at the Dresden University of Technology, Budapester Straße 27, 01069 Dresden, Dresden, Germany*

Objective
This study aimed to analyse retractions within periodontitis-related literature regarding characteristics, temporal and geographic trends. In addition, the primary reasons for retraction were examined to determine whether this field is particularly affected by scientific misconduct. As periodontitis represents one of the most prevalent diseases worldwide, the study seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of research integrity in the clinical practice of dentistry.

Methods
A bibliometric search of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and the Retraction Watch Database was conducted on February 6th, 2025, to identify retractions related to periodontitis. Data were extracted using a predefined Excel datasheet. Following AMSTAR-2 guidance, 10% of the records were independently assessed by two authors, yielding good agreement. Descriptive statistics were used for analysis.

Results
A total of 64 retracted articles were identified, corresponding to 0.08% of periodontitis-related publications across databases. Nearly 70% of the retraction notices were published from 2022 onwards, peaking in 2023. Chinese authors authored forty-four (68.8%) of the retractions, and 27 of 64 (42.2%) of the retractions were published by Hindawi. Regarding the cause of retraction, most retractions (52/64; 81.3%) were related to scientific misconduct, primarily misconduct in general, plagiarism, and unreliable data. Honest error was cited in eight cases, with the most prevalent reason being the use of overlapping gene expression datasets. Two articles (3.1%) provided no reason for retraction. The median time to retraction was 614.0 (IQR 345.3–1,074.8) days, and the median count of citations was 7.0 (IQR 1.8–20.0). The editor or publisher authorised more than 80% of the retractions. Approximately 80% of the retracted PDFs were watermarked. More than one-third of the retractions were not marked as retracted in Google Scholar.

Conclusion
Retractions in periodontitis-related research remain rare but have increased during the last five years, predominantly owing to misconduct. Standardisation and transparency in retraction notices, consistent labelling, and adherence to ethical research and publishing guidelines are essential to promote scientific integrity. By illuminating patterns of retraction, the study endeavours to strengthen awareness of research integrity, thereby safeguarding the evidential foundations upon which evidence-based dentistry and the treatment of patients with periodontitis ultimately depend.

P.79

Can I Trust You? A Virtue-ethical Approach to the Challenges of GenAI for Research

Dr. Jos Kole[1]
[1]*Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, Netherlands*

Science is a deeply social enterprise, and scientists are regularly profoundly personally involved, e.g. by their motivation and ambition, in doing research. Yet, the dominant view on science as a 'depersonalised' endeavour is still that the 'process' (methods of research) and its 'product' (trustworthy data, insights and knowledge) are most important.

Although promising for research, GenAI also raises many challenges to the integrity of science. The first (negative) claim argued for in this moral philosophical paper is that the antidote to GenAI's threat to the integrity of science will ultimately neither reside in adjustment, refinement and intensified quality control of the research process, nor in ever improved checks of the quality and 'integrity' of its products. We will never win the battle of adequately detecting irresponsible use of GenAI, due to its continuous improvement and the 'rewards' for using it irresponsibly.
The second (positive) and most important claim argued for will be that the best way to counter the undermining influence of GenAI to the integrity of science will be to invest in the selection, qualification, education and formation of researchers. Ultimately, and especially in the current circumstances, the quality and integrity of science has to be rooted in the 'personal' and professional qualities of researchers. In other words, researchers should have sufficiently developed the right moral, intellectual, performance and civic virtues, and the proper character to perform research with integrity. Only when we can trust each other as sufficiently virtuous researchers, we will have sufficient reason to rely on each other's methods (process) and resulting research output (product). Only then, we can trust that they aren't contaminated with irresponsible use of GenAI.

This requires also that we cultivate a research climate and culture in which virtuous researchers can flourish. Besides, we will have to discuss which new and additional virtues, e.g. authenticity, we need to develop collectively.

My arguments for the two claims will be embedded in the current literature on virtue ethics in relation to research integrity.
I declared not to have used any GenAI technology to write this abstract. Do you trust me?

P.81

Awards in Ecology and Evolution Societies: Growth, Bias, and Missed Opportunities

Dr. Malgorzata Lagisz[1]
[1]*University Of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada*

Objective
Awards are integral to research recognition and culture, reinforcing values and practices within the scientific community. We assessed how many awards exist across Eco-Evo societies, how their numbers and types have changed over time, what criteria and career stages they target, gender patterns in named awards, and whether monetary value differs by award type, category, or namesake gender.

Methods
We compiled a long-list of 214 Eco-Evo societies and extracted publicly available data from websites and documents. Only awards recognizing past achievements were included. We collected data at two levels: (1) society-level (name, weblink, eligibility, number of awards, and society "age"), and (2) award-level (name, status, type, target career stage, award "age," and monetary value). This two-step extraction ensured removal of ineligible awards and provided a comprehensive dataset for analyses of patterns in award distribution, criteria, and recognition practices across the international Eco-Evo community.

Results
We extracted data for 1012 eligible awards from 168 societies. Most societies award researchers for overall contributions or specific achievements in research. Awards for publications and presentations were also very common. In contrast, very few awards recognized mentoring, contributions to diversity and inclusion, or efforts to foster good research practices, including Open Science. Only a handful of awards specifically targeted researchers from minority or disadvantaged backgrounds. Approximately 31% of awards were named after a man, compared with only 4% named after a woman. Awards named after women also tended to carry lower monetary value. Most awards were established within the past 25 years, reflecting a rapid proliferation in the 21st century.

Conclusion
Eco-Evo learned societies are uniquely positioned to reshape recognition practices. By diversifying award categories, improving transparency, and ensuring equitable value across awards, societies can align incentives with the practices most needed to advance robust, inclusive science.

P.83

Developing an Indigenous Scholar in Residence Model for the National Research Council Canada

Mr. Evan Laye[1], ***Mrs. Natalie Collins***[1], ***Ms. Lisa Dixon***[1]
[1]*National Research Council Canada, Canada,* [2]*University of British Columbia, Kelowna, Canada*

Diverse perspectives in science are crucial to supporting innovation and building trust between the research community and the public. The Government of Canada recognizes that Indigenous Peoples have been major innovators since time immemorial, and Indigenous science as a distinct, time-tested, and methodological knowledge system that can enhance and complement western science. However, research has historically been completed on rather than with Indigenous Peoples in Canada, using methods that do not reflect Indigenous knowledge or cultural values. Indigenous Peoples, governments, and the Canadian research community have communicated a need for improved research practices that are more inclusive of Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and methods, as well as developing critical policies on ethical practices within Indigenous research. To address this, research must prioritize Indigenous ways of knowing in a way that is respectful, reciprocal, decolonizing, and upholds cultural values and self-determination throughout all research processes, methods, and knowledge translation/mobilization. This interweaving of Indigenous knowledge systems and research methods promotes ethical science and strengthens research processes and outcomes.

Over the past 2 years, the National Research Council Canada (NRC) has developed a model for the first Indigenous Scholar in Residence position at the organization, identifying this as an effective approach for realizing opportunities to advance Canadian research excellence through centering Indigenous voices and priorities in research methods. The NRC's Indigenous Scholar will undertake a research project, in collaboration with the University of British Columbia, designed to build the NRC's capacity for Indigenous-inclusive innovation by developing an Indigenous Science Framework that can be effectively applied throughout the organization. The final result of the research project will be a comprehensive, evidence-based, Indigenous-driven, tested resource that is informed by the practical experiences of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars, practitioners, scientists, and researchers.

P.85

Uncovering Hidden Risks: AI-Driven Insights to Strengthen Research Integrity in Manuscripts

*Ms. Rachel Ennis[1], **Mr. Nikesh Gosalia**, Shilpi Mehra[1], **Mr. Samuel Leslie***
[1]CACTUS, Singapore 069046, United Kingdom

Objective
To evaluate research integrity across submitted manuscripts and identify vulnerabilities, a leading multidisciplinary scientific publisher conducted a systematic audit of 2,579 manuscripts (2019–2025). The aim of the study was to assess the effectiveness of AI-assisted screening combined with expert human review in detecting integrity risks and creating targeted editorial strategies.

Methods
A three-stage evaluation was applied:

AI screening using 25 integrity checks for disclosures, papermill-style patterns, content coherence, and AI/text-generation markers, assigning “PASSED”, “WARNING”, or “CRITICAL” ratings

Expert human review of all “WARNING” manuscripts and a subset of “PASSED” and “CRITICAL” manuscripts was conducted

Comprehensive analysis of patterns and high-risk indicators for editorial recommendations

Results
Of the 2,579 manuscripts, 83% were classified as “PASSED”, while 17% were “CRITICAL”. The AI checks prioritized 23% of manuscripts for human review, helping editors focus on higher-risk papers. The most common integrity concerns included missing ethics, data disclosures, and papermill-style citation manipulation. Among 430 “CRITICAL” manuscripts, 115 were categorized as “Major Critical”, primarily due to citation manipulation or authors with prior retractions. Quarterly patterns revealed more high-risk manuscripts at specific times of the year. These findings underscore the importance of structured oversight, as many risks may not be detectable through routine peer review. Based on these insights, key editorial strategies were developed: implementing structured submission forms for ethics, data, funding, and conflicts; requiring pre-submission AI checks; monitoring citation patterns; establishing AI disclosure policies; and prioritizing “Major Critical” manuscripts via a “Red-Flag” dashboard. Together, these measures provide a proactive, data-driven approach to safeguarding research integrity while streamlining editorial workflows.

Conclusion
AI-assisted screening combined with expert human review enables targeted, scalable oversight of manuscript integrity. Systematic monitoring of disclosures, citation patterns, and author history can highlight high-retraction-risk submissions. These findings provide actionable strategies for publishers seeking to strengthen research integrity while improving editorial efficiency and author experience.

P.87

Publication status of meta-analyses related to mental disorders registered on PROSPERO between 2012 and 2021: retrospective cohort study

Mr. Chunwei Lyu[1], *Dr. Ioana Cristea*[1]
[1]*Department of General Psychology, University of Padova, Padova, Italy*

Objective
Meta-analyses play a substantial role in evidence generation. Prospective registration of these in public registries like PROSPERO increases transparency and reduces research waste, by preventing duplication of the same work. For registrations of meta-analyses related to mental disorders, we explored (1) whether and after how long registrations converted in full publications, separately for funded versus non-funded projects and (2) for unpublished registrations, whether the meta-analysis was completed and reasons for non-publication.

Method
We searched PROSPERO from May to December 2024 for registrations of Meta-analyses related to mental disorders registered between 2012 to 2021. Between January to May 2025, we searched Google Scholar using PROSPERO registration IDs and selected all identified publications. For registrations where we did not identify any publication, we developed a survey for the author listed in the registration inquiring about project completeness, potential submissions and reasons for non-completion or non-publication. We extracted funding status and whether the registration had been updated from PROSPERO registrations.

Results
We identified 462 registrations, of which we retrieved publications for (45.9%, 95% CI 41.4% to 50.4%) (51.4% funded, 95% CI 44.7% to 58.1%). Nineteen registration (9%, 95% CI 5.8% to 13.6%) had multiple publications under the same PROSPERO ID. Among the 212 protocols retrieved publications, the average time from registration to first publication was 22.9 months (median 20, range 1 - 90 months), at least one author differed between protocol and publication in 170 (80.2%, 95% CI 74.3% to 85.0%) cases. For 250 (54.1%, 95% CI 49.6% to 58.6%) no publications were identified (42.4% funded, 95% CI 36.4% to 48.6%), 98 (39.2%, 95% CI 33.4% to 45.4%) registrations included updates, however, since the 2024 only 8 (3.2%, 95% CI 1.6% to 6.2%) updated. The survey was sent to corresponding authors of 250 unpublished protocols and results are pending.

Conclusion
Our findings highlight that more than half of the registrations of meta-analyses related to mental health do not convert into published reports, which could relate to abandoned projects or publication bias. As meta-analyses are resource-intensive, transparently and timely updating the status of ongoing projects affords better planning and avoids research waste.

P.89

Building a Global Alliance to Strengthen Research Integrity Through Collaboration, Education, and Innovation

Dr. Luciana Machado[1], *James Parry*[1,2], *Full Professor Sigmar de Mello Rode*[3], *Dr Chiedozie Ike*[4], *Prof. Jennifer Byrne*[5], *Dr David Mellor*[6], *Prof. Edna Frasson De Souza Montero*[7], *Prof Lex Bouter*[8]
[1]*Science Integrity Alliance, Sunrise, USA,* [2]*James Parry Consulting Ltd., UK, , ,* [3]*Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Brazil,* [4]*Ambrose Alli University, Edo State, Nigeria,* [5]*University of Sydney, Australia,* [6]*Center for Open Science, USA,* [7]*Universidade de São Paulo (FMUSP), Brazil,* [8]*Amsterdam Universities Medical Center and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

The Science Integrity Alliance (SIA) is a growing global coalition dedicated to advancing research integrity. This presentation introduces SIA's innovative collaborative model and shares insights from its initial implementation phase and plans for continued development. It highlights strategies for building international, cross-sector partnerships through structured collaboration, capacity building, and inclusive engagement.

The collaborative model operates through three interconnected mechanisms that bridge divides across disciplines, sectors, and regions: cross-sector partnership networks linking academic, industry, government, and non-profit stakeholders; thematic working groups with representation from multiple regions to ensure diverse perspectives and context-sensitive approaches; and participatory governance structures shaped by continuous community feedback. To embed accountability and transparency from the outset, SIA established an international Advisory Board and an independent Editorial Committee, and appointed a Senior Strategic Advisor, creating a framework that prioritizes collaboration and independence from external influence.

The Alliance's educational approach innovates by moving beyond traditional top-down training to create a multi-tiered capacity-building platform featuring interactive, community-informed open educational resources, catalogs of research integrity solutions connecting users to relevant tools and services, and peer-to-peer knowledge-sharing forums. Following the launch of its first resources, the platform continues to expand its open-access materials and introduce additional content through a membership program that supports sustainable development and equitable access while avoiding competition for funding with the organizations and initiatives it serves. This commitment is reinforced through thematic working groups that help guide future resource allocation and co-led collaborative projects.

SIA's innovative model combines elements of a social enterprise and a collaborative network, aiming to bridge fragmentation in the research integrity landscape. Operating with a clear public-interest purpose, the Alliance plans to follow the example of other independent research integrity bodies by formalizing this commitment in its legal structure. With over 20 partner organizations and contributors from more than 15 countries, it demonstrates a growing capacity to serve as an independent hub for strengthening research integrity worldwide. The initiative welcomes collaboration from all who share its mission to advance a more transparent, accountable, and trustworthy scientific ecosystem.

P.91

Facilitators and Barriers in Ethics Reviews in Relation to Novel Challenges: A Qualitative Study of European Ethics Experts' Experiences

*Dr. Marija Franka Žuljević[1], Dr. Antonija Mijatović[1], Dr. Luciano D'Andrea[2], Dr. Andrada Istrate[3], Dr. Nevien Kerk[4], Dr. Constantin Vică[3], Dr. Alexandra Zorilă[3], Hella von Unger[4], **Prof. Ana Marušić**[1]*
[1]Centre for Evidence-based Medicine, University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia, [2]Knowledge and Innovation srls, Rome, Italy, [3]University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania, [4]LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

Objective
Our aim was to use a qualitative study design to explore the facilitators and barriers to ethics review for novel challenges (e.g., artificial intelligence, gene editing) among ethics review experts, particularly those conducting ethics review within European research framework or members of local research ethics committees (RECs).

Methods
We conducted 13 focus groups with participants from Europe. We used both in-person and web-based interviews via scheduled video calls on the Microsoft Teams online meeting platform. We followed a realist pragmatic approach, together with Braun and Clarke's framework for conducting thematic analysis.

Results
Our preliminary analysis of 6 out of 13 focus groups indicated several persistent barriers to effective ethics review, including knowledge gaps and lack of expertise, institutional inertia, resource constraints, fragmented oversight, role confusion, and limited engagement or motivation. To address these challenges, participants proposed increased capacity building and education, system-level improvements, staged ethics reviews and more scrutiny and monitoring, as well as greater stakeholder engagement.

Conclusion
The current ethics review system has several limitations when dealing with novel challenges and technologies and needs to be adapted through close monitoring and tailoring of education and existing ethics review frameworks.

P.93

BEYOND Best Practices Manual: a complement to the BEYOND Guidelines for Preventing and Addressing Research Misconduct

*Mrs. Keziah Chanyisa Khayadi Dash[1], **Prof. Rosemarie De La Cruz Bernabe**[1], **Ms. Pooja Aryal**[1], **Dr. Vivian Mbanya**[1]*
[1]University Of Oslo, OSLO, Norway

Objective
The Best Practice Manual is a complement to the BEYOND Guidelines; its purpose is to provide context and practical knowledge for the readers of the BEYOND Guidelines. The objective is to increase trust in science by providing operational guidance on best practices to prevent RM and support an inclusive approach to RE/RI based on a holistic research ecosystem perspective. The case studies of successfully implemented measures to prevent RM and promote RE/RI will advance a holistic and complex research ecosystem perspective on RE/RI and contribute to replacing the flawed Bad Apple theory.

Methods
The Manual uses case and evidence-based approach distilling knowledge from various sources including behavioral and organizational ethics, moral psychology, institutional theory, cases of RM, socio-economics, public consultation, relevant literature reviews and scoping reviews, complexity science, and relevant studies on training and pedagogy all stemming from the BEYOND deliverables, milestones and publications and other relevant references.

Results
The best practice manual presents key findings organised into four main areas:

Introduction and definition of terms:
A glossary of key terms explaining different meanings and understanding of how the words have been used in the best practice manual.

Individual, Organisational, and Structural Causes of Research Misconduct;
The section delves into the psychological causes of RM by individuals, organizations, and various structural settings.

Preventing and Addressing Research Misconduct (RM)
This section explores the broader implications of RM, including its socio-economic consequences, impact on researchers' mental health and well-being, and its effect on public trust in science. Recommendations for managing RM address political sensitivity and strategies to protect trust, rehabilitation and reintegration of researchers' post-misconduct, whistleblower protections and consultation mechanisms, as well as the use of nudges—subtle, non-coercive changes to the research environment that promote ethical decision-making.

RE/RI Education and Training
The final section focuses on fostering ethical behaviour through comprehensive training. It emphasizes building knowledge, skills, values, and habits that enable researchers to self-regulate, particularly in areas vulnerable to ethical lapses (e.g., selective data analysis). The guidelines advocate for the use of innovative pedagogical tools and underscore the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of RE/RI training programs.

P.95

Comparing the Frequency of Suspected AI-Generated Text in Paper Mill Manuscripts Before and After the Introduction of ChatGPT

Dr. Clare Mc Fadden[1], *Dr. Renee Hoch*[2]
[1]*Publication Ethics Team, PLOS, PLOS, United Kingdom,* [2]*Publication Ethics Team, PLOS, PLOS, United States of America*

Objective
The emergence of generative AI (genAI) tools such as ChatGPT have intensified concerns about their misuse in scientific publishing, especially in producing fraudulent or low-quality manuscripts from paper mills, which have proliferated in recent years. This study aims to test anecdotal claims of increased genAI use by paper mills by comparing the frequency of suspected AI-generated text in paper mill manuscripts submitted before and after the public release of ChatGPT.

Methods
A cohort of suspected paper mill submissions from before and after the release of ChatGPT will be used for this investigation; all are PLOS One submissions related to a specific topic for which there has been confirmed and ongoing paper mill activity since 2020. Only submissions with at least two paper mill features of concern will be included. The Before-ChatGPT (BC) and After-ChatGPT (AC) cohorts will be composed of submissions received in 2020-2021 and 2024-2025, respectively. A third cohort of 2024-2025 submissions with no known features of paper mill activity will be included as a control (Con). The cohorts will be assessed manually by two Senior Publication Ethics Editors with expertise in paper mill and AI output detection, as well as being assessed using multiple automated AI text detection tools.

Results
This study's findings will investigate whether genAI use in a long-running paper mill case has increased since the release of ChatGPT. We will thereby test a common assumption about AI and paper mills, using a data-centered approach to examine how genAI is influencing the evolution of paper mill activity. The study will also investigate the consistency between human and automated detection. This project will utilize paper mill content previously investigated by PLOS and will be completed in early 2026.

Conclusions
This research will provide empirical evidence on the changing landscape of AI use in paper mill manuscripts. The findings will offer practical insights for editors and publishers when considering the efficacy of current screening protocols and editorial policies in the era of genAI.

P.97

Questionable Research with High-Profile Attention: A Case for Funders' Due Diligence

*Ms. Federica Silvi[1], **Dr. Leslie Mcintosh**[1]*
[1]Digital Science, London, United Kingdom

Objective
A surge in research outputs has flooded scholarly literature since 2016. The larger the volume, the bigger the risk of polluting literature with unverifiable results and low-quality work. But there are more tangible consequences: when scarce funding supports less innovative or even unscrupulous work, the system actively squanders investments. This poster focuses on policy and guideline mentions gained by authors tied to a fictional network publishing questionable research.

Method
Pharmakon Neuroscience Network (PNN), identified in 2022, was a collective of over 300 authors who appeared to be in an authorship-for-sale network. A surge in publications (N=120) and citations (N=6612) occurred from 2019-2023, referencing PNN as affiliation, funder, or acknowledgement. Using Altmetric, which tracks attention to research across several sources, we collected mentions of papers authored by PNN members in policy documents or clinical guidelines.

Results
A 2025 investigation shows that over 20 authors tied to PNN received grants worth at least (US equivalent) $6.5M since 2022. To explore whether questionable research can influence policy and clinical guidelines, and therefore the evidence of real-world impact researchers can show in funding applications, we focused our analysis on five authors from this list, totalling 82 mentions.

The author with the most clinical guideline mentions (N=26) stood out because two US government agencies called out a 2013 grant-funded paper for serious misconduct; Retraction Watch also covered the case. Between 2013 (when the paper was published) and 2024 (when misconduct was reported), the author received six grants.

We also identified an author with 23 papers mentioned 30 times in policy, and a body of work with characteristics consistent with questionable activity: a publication record beginning in 1992, with a significant surge between 2020-2023 (58% of publications), and a network of 1,873 co-authors.

Conclusion
Questionable papers can generate attention in legitimate policy and guidelines, which can build a strong narrative on a CV. This gives candidates with illegitimate credentials advantages over researchers with genuine bodies of work, while diverting taxpayer funding. Hence, reviewing the quality and legitimacy of research is also the responsibility of funders.

P.99

From Credibility Frameworks to Verifiable Research Pipelines for AI-driven Science

Dr. Tina Morrison
[1]*EQTY Lab, Glendora, USA*

Journals and publishers share duties of oversight like regulators: protecting public trust by accepting only credible research, despite that they're not involved in generating or validating that work. After 17 years as a regulator in public health, I developed frameworks that enabled reviewers to judge the credibility of new methodologies against their context of use (COU), without the resources (e.g., time, means) to reproduce the science. While credibility frameworks remain essential, AI-driven research challenges reliance on social trust alone. Assessment frameworks provide critical questions, but certifying AI-powered science grows increasingly complex, fostering skepticism and reluctance, instead of bolstering trust.

Traditional analytics assessment focuses on verification (correct implementation and execution?) and validation (appropriate methods?). I argue that verifiable pipelines—where the computer attests to all compute actions—shift assessment from "did the code really run as stated?" to questions that matter for research integrity and impact: Is the pipeline relevant to the stated COU? Are uncertainty and limitations disclosed? Are claims proportionate to evidence?

High-stakes biomedical research should adopt verifiable pipelines that automatically generate compact, cryptographic "evidence bundles" at each step: data curation, model training/fine-tuning, inference/analysis, and report generation. Each bundle includes certificates capturing content fingerprints, code identity, execution environment, and policy checks (de-identification, data-access scopes, guardrails), digitally signed by the computer. This enables editors and reviewers to confirm what ran, where, with which inputs/outputs, and under which controls—without re-running work or accessing protected information.

This talk showcases a viable prototype fitting existing editorial workflows: (1) verify-as-you-go certificates packaged with data/code availability statements; (2) COU-and-claims tables mapping results to evidence bundles and prespecified relevance metrics (calibration/uncertainty coverage, clinical endpoints); and (3) verifiable manifests for offline third-party integrity confirmation without pipeline re-execution.

Using AI-driven imaging and non-AI real-world data examples, I demonstrate how verifiable pipelines accelerate triage, focus methods review, and enhance editorial consistency and confidence. This transition enables verifiable science, shifting the focus to relevance of data and methods rather than reproducibility—essential infrastructure as biomedical research evolves toward autonomous discovery while maintaining rigorous integrity standards.

P.101

Editorial Policy Diversity Across Selected Journals: A Cross-Disciplinary Survey of Authorship and Duplicate Submission Policies

Dr. Masaki Nakamura[1], *Dr. Yumi Aizawa, Jin Higashijima*[2]
[1]*The University of Osaka, Toyonaka, Japan,* [2]*Chiba University, Chiba, Japan*

Objective
The purpose of this study is to examine current trends in the submission guidelines of selected academic journals, focusing on authorship and duplicate submission/publication policies. Specifically, it aims to identify similarities and differences across academic fields and publishers, and to characterize distinctive editorial practices at the journal level, thereby highlighting both disciplinary diversity and shared editorial tendencies.

Method
Submission guidelines regarding authorship and duplicate submissions/publications were collected from the official websites of 50 academic journals with the highest Elsevier Site Score, selected to cover multiple fields, including life sciences, medicine, chemistry, engineering, social sciences, and the humanities. In the survey on authorship, questions concerning “qualifying contributions” were among several items examined. Regarding duplicate submissions/publications, the survey also asked whether journals clearly stated what is considered acceptable or unacceptable in cases such as simultaneous submission in another language, preprint-based publication, and conference proceedings-based publication. Collected data were analyzed statistically and visually, including a heat map, word-frequency by field, and hierarchical clustering.

Results
The analysis revealed both shared patterns and distinct variations across disciplines and publishers. In general, authorship policies frequently included conceptualization of the research as qualifying contributions, while explicit reference to accountability was relatively rare. Regarding duplicate submissions/publications, many journals clearly state policies regarding simultaneous submission of the same manuscript to another journal in the same language. However, relatively limited number specified conditions related to submission in another language. As for difference by field, journals in medicine and life sciences tend to specify authorship criteria and contributions responsibilities in greater detail, whereas those in engineering and the humanities adopt more flexible approach. Major publishers such as Elsevier and Springer Nature maintained relatively standardized frameworks, whereas independent journals displayed greater variation.

Conclusion
Editorial policies on authorship and duplicate submissions/publication differ across fields and publishers. As this study is based on a limited dataset and represents a preliminary analysis, further research involving a broader range of journals and academic fields will be required to deepen our understanding of disciplinary patterns in research-integrity practices.

P.103

A Survey About Researchers' Perspectives on Computational Reproducibility

*Yuri A Gelsleichter[2], Rita Banzi[3], **Dr. Florian Naudet**[1,4], Constant Vinatier[1], István Kertész[5], Mónika Varga[6]*
[1]University of Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail)-UMR_S 1085, CIC 1414 (Centre of Clinical Investigation of Rennes), Rennes, France, , France, [2]Department of Soil Science, Institute of Environmental Sciences, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Páter Károly u. 1, H-2100 Gödöllö, , Hungary, [3]Laboratory for Health Regulatory Policies, Mario Negri Institute for Pharmacological Research IRCCS, Milan, , Italy, [4]Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, , France, [5]Institute of Food Science and Technology, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Buda Campus, , Hungary, [6]Institute of Animal Sciences, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 40 Guba S, 7400 Kaposvar, , Hungary

Given the widespread use and development of digitalization in most of scientific disciplines, alongside the increasing importance of data and code sharing for reproducibility and reuse, our goal was to assess researchers' daily practices, barriers and needs.
An anonymized, multidisciplinary survey was conducted to gather insights from researchers who apply digital data collection and analysis. The survey, consisted of six sections covering demographics, open science practices, as well as data and code publishing and reuse, was administered through LimeSurvey. It was advertised via social media, newsletters of professional networks, organizations, and printed materials at scientific conferences between February and September 2024.
254 people initiated the survey, with a total of 133 complete responses (mostly from Europe, equally distributed amongst scientific fields). As some examples, survey revealed that study registration is the least applied practice (56%), while open software and OA publishing demonstrated widespread adoption among 83% and 69% of respondents, respectively. Data sharing is hindered by the lack of time (60%), followed by the lack of sufficient funding (44%), and the sensitive characteristics of data (41%). Among predefined obstacles of code sharing, the Lack of time to build proper documentation (65%), the Pressure to publish (51%) and the Insufficient funding to prepare code for sharing (42%) are the most mentioned reasons. On the other side, most stimulating factor would be requirement of journals to share data/code (score: 482), followed by incentives and rewards by institutions (score: 439). Survey shows that 26% of researchers never tried to reproduce a study, and when replication is attempted, researchers often find that open data (70%), open code (71%), and metadata (84%) are missing or incomplete. Analysis of open-ended responses highlighted the need for training, career-stage guidelines, and basic programming skills for researchers.
Although the likely low response rate may limit its representativeness, study provides an up-to-date snapshot. A recurrent theme throughout the replies is the need for structural incentives and institutional support. Researchers claim that making work reproducible requires time, resources, and expertise, while these efforts are rarely rewarded in the conventional academic evaluation systems, highlighting the need for a systemic cultural shift.

P.105

Enhancing Ethical Decision-Making among Health Science Students through Research Integrity Education: An Empirical Evaluation of a Drama-Based Teaching Approach

Dr. Akinori Yamabe[1], *Dr. Rio Otsuka*[1], *Dr. Chiaki Mishima*[1], *Dr. Shio Kawagoe*[2]
[1]*Jichi Medical University, Shimotsuke-shi, Japan,* [2]*The University of Tokyo, Meguro-ku, Japan*

Objective
This study evaluated the educational effectiveness of a research integrity program designed to enhance ethical decision-making among health science students. The course, conducted from April to June 2025, involved 60 undergraduate students and focused on ethical challenges specific to medical and clinical research settings.

Methods
The program consisted of three components: (1) an introductory lecture by the instructor, (2) viewing a dramatized case depicting research misconduct in a university–industry collaborative project, and (3) a post-viewing discussion and faculty-led commentary. Pre- and post-course surveys were conducted using an educational management system to assess the perceived learning gains.

Results
Survey responses indicated substantial improvements in the students' understanding and ethical awareness after the course. Regarding the ability to explain the research publication process, responses of "can explain" or "mostly can explain" increased from 15/60 (25%) before to 51/60 (85%) after the program. Awareness of research misconduct increased markedly, with 61/60 (100%) participants reporting deeper post-course engagement. The sense that "research misconduct could relate to oneself" rose from 3/60 (5%) to 54/60 (90%). Understanding of the "background factors leading to misconduct" improved from 8/60 (13%) to 58/60 (97%). Similarly, the ability to "propose measures to prevent misconduct" increased from 10/60 (17%) to 52/60 (87%). These findings suggest that combining audiovisual materials, narrative dramatization, and guided reflection is highly effective in fostering students' moral reasoning and self-awareness of research integrity.

Conclusion
This study demonstrates the significant educational impact of interactive, narrative-based research ethics instruction on medical education. Drama-based learning and reflective dialogue effectively enhanced ethical sensitivity and responsibility among undergraduate health science students.

P.107

Determinants of Intention to Adhere to Open Science Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Ugandan Quantitative Needs Assessment

Ms. Hellen Opolot[1], *Beth Mutumba*[1], *Mrs. Irene Ssemakula*[1], *Dr. Martin Ongol*[1]
[1]*Uganda National Council for Science and Technology, Kampala, Uganda*

Objective
This abstract synthesizes findings from a cross-sectional quantitative assessment conducted to understand drivers of researchers' intention to comply with Research Integrity code of conduct (RI CoC) and Open Science (OS) practices in Sub-Saharan Africa. This abstract synthesizes results on determinants of intention to adhere to open science policies in Uganda.

Method
The study surveyed 565 participants (researchers and regulators). The sample was predominantly male (57%) and largely drawn from medical and life sciences disciplines (44%), with researchers constituting the majority (76%). Data was collected via an electronically distributed survey instrument and analysed descriptively on the level of intention and related attitudes to adhere to OS practices.

Results
97% of respondents indicate an intention to comply with OS-related expectations, and 88% expressed intent to undertake OS training. However, 80% reported only limited institutional pressure to adhere to OS standards. Despite this high willingness, a sizable proportion reported low perceived behavioural pressure: 80% felt there is not much institutional pressure to adhere to OS standards. This apparent disconnect between high stated intention and perceived normative pressure suggests that individual motivations may be influenced more by personal or intrinsic factors than by formal coercive or social influences within institutions. Enablers such as clear policy articulation, accessible OS frameworks (e.g., OSF, OS repositories), and formal training opportunities appear pivotal in bridging intention and action. This divergence suggests that intrinsic motivation and personal commitment to quality and transparency are primary drivers, rather than coercive or normative forces alone.

Conclusion
Implications for policy and practice include: (1) strengthening OS cultures through policy mandates, governance accountability; (2) capacity-building in OS concepts, preregistration and data management; (3) investment in OS infrastructure such as open data repositories; and (4) integrating OS requirements into regulatory and funding criteria to amplify normative expectations.

P.109

Exploring Research Ethics Training across Different Contexts: Reflections from the iRECS Project

Ms. Claudia Pallise Perello[1], *Susan Berentsen*[1,2], *Dr. Giulia Inguaggiato*[1], *Dr Natalie Evans*[1], *Prof. Mariëtte Van Den Hoven*[1]
[1]*Amsterdam Umc, Amsterdam, Netherlands,* [2]*HAN University of Applied Sciences, Nijmegen, Netherlands*

Objective
The irecs (improving Research Ethics expertise and Competencies to ensure reliability and Trust in Science, funded by the EU) project aims to design and implement sustainable training materials on research ethics of emerging technologies such as biobanking, artificial intelligence in healthcare, gene editing, and extended reality. For these materials to be effectively used across different settings, it is essential that the relevance and applicability are evaluated. Prior studies have shown how contextual adaptation in ethics education makes educational interventions more successful. For this reason, this study explores the perceived relevance and applicability of irecs training materials across diverse cultural, social, and regulatory contexts.

Methods
This study is based on reflective interviews, an adaptation of the reflective interviewing framework proposed by Nardon et al. (2021). This method uses interviewing as an intervention tool that allows for mutual reflection and co-construction of knowledge between researcher and participant. Interviews were conducted online, audio-recorded, transcribed and analysed inductively to identify patterns and contextual insights related to the materials' use and adaptation.

Results
This study includes interviews with 13 participants from European and non-European institutions who have been trained as trainers using the irecs materials.
Participants identified different areas for improvements such as: a) the need for a more balanced framing of technologies, highlighting that modules are often very much focused on technology risks; b) the importance of including tips for adapting interactive exercises to different audiences age groups, and geographic areas, including the need for more contextually grounded examples and case studies that explicitly mention local regulatory and legal frameworks; c) the lack of non-European ethical frameworks and communitarian perspectives, and explicitly mentioned African perspectives and contexts as specially underrepresented, and d) the importance of translations and support for trainers with limited experience in teaching on emerging technologies.

Conclusion
Preliminary findings highlight the importance of contextual adaptation, inclusion of diverse ethical frameworks and practical implementation guidance to ensure globally relevant research ethics training. This study also shows how ongoing assessment of ethics and integrity training materials is crucial for improving the global relevance and adaptability of such materials.

P.111

Perceptions of Large Language Models in Academic Research: A Cross-sectional Survey of Early-Career Researchers

Mr. Lodewijk Pet[1], *Prof. Frits Rosendaal*[1], *Bob Siegerink*[1,2]
[1]*Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands, Leiden, Netherlands,* [2]*Directorate of Research Policy, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands, Leiden, Netherlands*

Background
Large language models (LLMs) are already part of daily practice in biomedical research in many ways. While they can improve efficiency, their use is sometimes regarded as questionable or even research misconduct. The perception of early-career researchers is essential, as they perform most daily research tasks. Their perceptions shape norms around acceptable use. We aimed to identify which uses of LLMs are considered good practices and which are considered bad.

Methods
325 PhD candidates from Leiden University (77% response proportion) participated and provided information on their current LLM usage. They evaluated perceived practice-valence on a –2 to +2 scale (–2 = very bad practice; +2 = very good practice) and expected frequency on a 1–5 Likert scale (1 = never; 5 = whenever possible) across 20 scenarios spanning four research phases (design, analysis, writing, peer review) and five LLM use types (e.g., idea generation; text/grammar/code correction and creation; adapting to the writing style of the LLM).

Results
LLMs were frequently used by 26% of participants for data analysis and for article writing. All scenarios using LLMs for text, grammar, or code correction were regarded as good research practice (means +1.1 to +1.4 on the –2 to +2 scale). All scenarios using LLMs for text creation were regarded as bad practice (means –1.2 to –0.5). Using LLMs in the peer-review phase was seen as the worst phase (-0.41). In all scenarios, adapting to the style of the LLM was viewed as a bad practice, even when it enhanced text quality. All scenarios were expected to occur frequently (Likert 2.9 to 4.4 on the 1–5 scale).

Conclusions
PhD candidates already use LLMs and expect their use to become common. Perceived acceptability depends strongly on how LLMs are used: correction tasks are viewed positively, text creation negatively, and peer review is a particular problem area. Accordingly, codes of conduct should address LLM use via disclosure requirements, task-specific guidance, and phase-specific restrictions (e.g., prohibiting LLM use in confidential peer review), rather than a single general rule. Future work should examine disciplinary differences and the impact of training and disclosure policies on these perceptions.

P.113

Fostering Research Integrity through Nationwide Training in Thailand and Lessons Learned

Miss Rattanapan Phoomirat[1], *Miss Rujikorn Sabsompong*[1], *Miss Rawinun Sutthikitivorakul*[1], *Mr. Tanapon Saelao*[1], *Miss Nattanun Iamjangpan*[1], *Miss Nattapat Rakkarn*[1], *Mrs. Thitiwan Kerdsomboon*[1]
[1]*National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA), Pathum Thani, Thailand*

Research integrity is a crucial issue that shapes national research standards. In many cases, research misconduct arises from a lack of knowledge and awareness among researchers and organizations. Establishing national standards through training is therefore essential to promote a shared understanding of research integrity among Thai researchers and institutions. To address this need, two research integrity training sessions were conducted at Nakhon Phanom University (23 May 2025) and Chiang Mai University (25 July 2025). The program covered key topics, including responsible conduct of research, misconduct prevention, oversight mechanisms through the establishment of an Office of Research Integrity (ORI), and national standards. Participants who passed the post-test and fulfilled the requirements were awarded a training certificate. More than 3,800 participants attended the research integrity training and received certificates. This large participation may reflect the requirement of the National Research Council of Thailand (NRCT), which mandates that researchers applying for NRCT grants must complete research integrity training. However, several participants misunderstood the distinction between research integrity training and human research ethics training, possibly due to Thai terminology where “research ethics” is often used broadly, while the newly introduced term for research integrity is not yet widely recognized. This indicates a need for clearer communication. Important lessons emerged from the training. First, the development of standardized national research integrity courses with consistent quality is essential. Second, the structure of training could be adapted into modular formats to shorten the duration and better suit the context of participants. Third, course content and invited speakers should represent both scientific and social research perspectives to ensure inclusiveness. The outcomes of this training provide valuable insights for developing a national research integrity training program, which is a key strategy to enhance awareness and knowledge of research integrity in Thailand. Furthermore, conducting training at universities in provincial regions can serve as a mechanism for promoting the Thailand Research Integrity Network, while ensuring equal opportunities for institutions across the country to access training on research integrity.

P.115

Assessing the Impact of Clinical Trials Associated with German University Medical Centers on the Body of Evidence and Results in Cochrane Reviews

Dr. Merle-Marie Pittelkow[1,2], *Vladislav Nachev*[1], *Dr. Julian Hirt*[3,4,5], *Dr. Lars G. Hemkens*[4,6,7], *Dr Daniel Strech*[1], *Susanne Schorr*[1]

[1]*QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany,* [2]*Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Institute of Clinical Nursing Science, Berlin, Germany,* [3]*Department of Health, Eastern Switzerland University of Applied Sciences, St Gallen, Switzerland,* [4]*Research Center for Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel (RC2NB), University Hospital Basel and University of Basel, , Switzerland,* [5]*Institute of Health, Midwifery and Nursing Science, Medical Faculty, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany,* [6]*Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, USA,* [7]*Pragmatic Evidence Lab, Department of Clinical Research, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland*

Background

Given the resource-intensive nature of clinical trials, it is essential to evaluate their impact on clinical practice to ensure research funding is used effectively. One approach is to examine whether trial results are referenced in systematic reviews, which shape research agendas, inform funding and policy decisions, and guide evidence-based practice. In this study, we focus on Cochrane reviews, widely regarded as the gold standard for systematic reviews. As Cochrane reviews follow a structured data format, they provide an ideal basis for developing an automated approach to inspect different citation contexts and offering a more nuanced picture of clinical impact via citations. We aim to systematically identify and analyze the extent to which a sample of clinical trial results publications from trials associated with German university medical centers completed between 2009 and 2017 are cited in Cochrane reviews.

Methods

A methodological plan is available on OSF (https://osf.io/4r35f/overview). We will use a publicly accessible dataset of clinical trial results publications linked to trials registered in Deutsches Register Klinischer Studien and ClinicalTrials.gov. The data set is publicly accessible at: https://osf.io/26dgx/. Only full journal publications with a DOI or PMID will be included. Cochrane reviews will be identified based on standardized DOI patterns, excluding protocols, methodological reviews, and withdrawn or retracted versions. We will conduct forward citation searches in PubMed and OpenAlex. Citation types will be classified based on reference categories (e.g., included, excluded, awaiting assessment). Descriptive analyses will summarize trial characteristics and citations (e.g. how many clinical trial results publications are included in the evidence body of at least one Cochrane review). A purposively selected subset of citations will undergo exploratory qualitative analysis to explore differences in the impact of clinical trial results publications at both review and meta-analysis levels.

Since we are working with pre-existing data, results are expected by January 2026.

Conclusion

This study will provide empirical evidence on how often and in what ways clinical trial results from German UMCs are represented in Cochrane reviews. Our methodological approach may also serve as a scalable framework for evaluating clinical research impact in other settings.

P.117

AI and Equity in Scholarly Publishing: Global Patterns of Adoption, Trust, and Fairness

Ms. Simone Ragavooloo[1], *Katie Allin*[1]
[1]*Frontiers Media SA, Greater London, UK, United Kingdom*

Objective
This poster presents a global survey on adoption and perceptions of AI tools in scholarly publishing, analyzing regional disparities and trust gaps.

Methods
A global survey was conducted in May–June 2025 with 1,645 active researchers who had authored, reviewed, or edited within the past year. Respondents represented diverse regions, disciplines, and seniority levels. Quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed; this poster focuses on findings related to adoption patterns, equity, and trust.

Results
Regional adoption: AI adoption was reported by 77% of respondents, with regional differences; with highest use in China (91%), Africa (88%), and Asia (87%), compared with North America (55%) and Europe (76%).

Equity, and trust: Perceptions of AI's potential varied sharply by region. A majority in Africa (70%), Asia (64%), China (64%), and the Americas (61%) believed AI could empower underrepresented researchers, particularly non-native English speakers. By contrast, only 36% in North America and 47% in Europe agreed. Only 22% of North American and 34% of European respondents believed publisher AI promotes equity, compared with 56% in China and 52% in Asia and the Americas. Respondents voiced concerns that unequal access to AI could widen gaps between regions, with low-resource areas disadvantaged and English-speaking authors benefiting disproportionately. Others warned of hidden biases or a "false illusion of equity." Some noted opportunities: AI could support non-native English speakers and reduce subjective bias in peer review. This has important implications for publishers' deployment of AI and provides context for the 45% worried that publishers might deploy AI opaquely or unfairly.

Conclusion
Findings show that without targeted action, AI risks reinforcing barriers and contributing to mistrust, eroding confidence in research. AI can reduce disparities in publishing, but equity and trust cannot be assumed. Publishers must deploy AI transparently, with bias-awareness, monitoring, and accessibility. Funders should promote equity by financing access and training in low- and middle-income regions. Institutions must provide targeted guidance to support adoption for resource-limited researchers. Policymakers should establish global frameworks embedding fairness and transparency at the heart of responsible AI use. Together, these actions can ensure AI strengthens, not undermines, equity in scholarly publishing.

P.119

Partnering to Change Culture: Advancing Rigor and Transparency in Neurosciences through PIE CHART

Dr. Melissa Rethlefsen[1], *Dr. Danielle Maurici-Pollock*[1], *Prof. Leah Everitt*[1], *Prof. Will White*[1], *Ms. Ingrid Hendrix*[1], *Dr. Sam McKenzie*[2], *Dr. C. W. Shuttleworth*[2]

[1]*Health Sciences Library & Informatics Center, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, USA,* [2]*Department of Neurosciences, School of Medicine, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, USA*

PIE CHART (Policies, Infrastructure, and Education to CHAmpion Rigor and Transparency) is a new program seeking to develop, test, and iterate sustainable models for improving the culture of rigor and transparency within the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center. This program is a unique partnership between the Health Sciences Library & Informatics Center and the Department of Neurosciences. This partnership enables departmental interventions, but also aims to benefit the broader community at the University of New Mexico. Using the Center for Open Science's Strategy for Culture Change framework, PIE CHART aims to incentivize rigorous and transparent neuroscience research through the creation of rewards and changes to departmental and institutional policies; develop sustainable infrastructure to improve the rigor and transparency of neurosciences research by adding personnel and technologies to support data curation, data sharing, and collaboration; and develop a suite of educational offerings designed to build skills, knowledge, and awareness for rigorous, transparent research across all levels of experience, from graduate students to established research faculty. Some examples include Data Carpentries training, workshops on research data management and sharing, reproducibility hackathons, and rigor and reproducibility curricular courses. In this poster, we will describe the development of this innovative program during PIE CHART's first year. This includes data on educational sessions taught, plus any evaluation information available. We will also share baseline data on the Department of Neurosciences' open publication, data sharing, and other open research practices. Lastly, we will share preliminary information on adoption of new technologies and practices for open and transparent research across the University of New Mexico campus.

P.121

Office of Ethics and Good Practices in Research Communication (SciELO Ethics)

Prof. Sigmar Rode[1,2], *MSc Denise Peres*[2], *Librarian Maria Santos*[2], *MSc Abel Packer*[2]
[1]*Abec Brasil, São Paulo, Brazil,* [2]*SciELO Ethics Office, São Paulo, Brazil*

The SciELO Program meticulously follows the norms and recommendations for ethical and responsible standards in scientific communication. Scientific journals must constantly seek to identify misconduct and prevent the publication of documents where such practices have been found.
To assist and support the journals of the SciELO Network across 17 countries, the OFFICE OF ETHICS AND GOOD PRACTICES IN SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATION (SciELO Ethics) was created in 2023.
SciELO Ethics will only act when prompted by a complaint from a reader, author, reviewer, editor, or a journal's maintainer. The committee's role will be to recommend measures to prevent, educate, and penalize breaches of scientific publication integrity; to develop and disseminate guidelines on best practices in conducting and publishing research; to propose or facilitate initiatives to prevent scientific misconduct and promote good publication practices; and to investigate claims of research or publication misconduct within a SciELO program journal.
SciELO Ethics operates with a coordinator appointed by the SciELO Program's Scientific Committee for a 5-year term. The term ensures independence in conducting the process and making decisions. The coordinator will also have a seat on the SciELO Brazil Advisory Committee.
Upon receiving a demand, the coordinator is required to appoint an Evaluation Committee to the Advisory Committee, consisting of the coordinator, the director of the SciELO program, three editors from SciELO journals pertinent to the area, with at least one representative from the Advisory Committee, and external ad hoc advisors.
All decisions made will be supported by an appropriate legal opinion and based on the COPE, et al. Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in the Scholarly Publishing Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) 2022.
SciELO Ethics has already received and evaluated complaints of plagiarism (3 cases), paper mills (4 cases), methodological error (1 case), and improper APC charges (1 case).
The analysis of these complaints, the suggestions presented, and the resolutions adopted by the journals will be presented and discussed.

P.123

DREAMR: A Web-Based Tool to Assess the Representation of Articles Included in Meta-Research

Ms. Maia Salholz-Hillel[1], ***Dr. Stephanie Zellers***, *Rachel Heyard, Dr. Tracey Weissgerber, Dr. Kimberley Wever, Dr. Peter Degen, Dr. Yu-Fang Yang, Chris Sena,* ***Dr. Kaitlyn Hair***
[1]*BIH-QUEST Center for Responsible Research @ Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany*

Publications reporting research on human participants, such as clinical trials, commonly include a table summarizing the relevant characteristics of the study sample. These tables are crucial to compare studies, assess generalisabillity and identify understudied populations. In metaresearch and evidence syntheses, where the sample is comprised of research articles, tables describing characteristics such as the proportion of open access publications, the publication language, and authors' institutional affiliation or gender are uncommon. Without this information, our understanding of the generalisability of study findings is limited, and researchers cannot compare sample characteristics across studies, or assess the impact of different sampling methods. The inclusion of a standardized sample characteristics table would promote the more responsible conduct of research on articles and foster research integrity. However, collating these characteristics manually would require substantial time and resources.

The Describing the REpresentation of Articles in Meta-Research (DREAMR) project (1) proposes a standard sample characteristics table structure for studies performed on research articles, (2) evaluates which of these characteristics can be assessed by automated tools, and (3) develops a tool pipeline and web application that allows researchers to quickly generate a sample characteristics table using existing automated tools. With this poster, we will describe the development of the tool and design choices, as well as present a prototype of the tool. We aim to gather feedback on the design and usability tool, discover potential user groups and uses, and recruit collaborators to join this open research software development project.

P.125

Research Integrity and Authorship in an Engineering Environment

Dr. Helmut Schift[1]
[1]*Paul Scherrer Institut (psi), Villigen PSI, Switzerland*

The rules for scientific integrity and publication for engineers and physicists in technology domains are not different from those other area in science. However, due to the collaborative, often interdisciplinary nature of their research, and the ability to produce a device that is based on processes sequences using standard tools (e.g., in a cleanroom environment for chip manufacturing), several issues must be considered in publishing results. In cleanroom-related research, it is difficult to distinguish between standard and novel processes that result in a meaningful innovative step that warrants authorship. Tools are often operated by experts (technicians, engineers, and scientist), and process optimizations and combination of processes lead to desired results. Consulting takes place in formal and informal meetings, and by joint processing of samples or interpretation of results. Processes, that were once unique have become standard processes, but still require expert knowledge. Authorship lists are long, and often involve persons who did participate in consulting but were not setting up processes that have been used. Contributions range from continuous supervision to mere services. Technological publications are prone to salami tactics, and technological and scientific results are separately published or split between different first authors. Publication of incremental improvements is frequent, while hands-on knowledge (detailed process schemes) is often not communicated. Similar results are often published by different groups and processes “re-invented”. Authors now tend to submit their technological results to high-ranking journals, however, they would often be more suitable for proceedings and technological journal, where technological steps could be described. In my contribution, I want to point out which questionable research and publication practices could origin from this setting and what solutions have been established until now. E.g., publishers offer the possibility of extra publications, e.g., Elsevier in Research Elements journals (e.g. data, methods, protocols, software, and hardware) related to original research. Current open access policy favors the finding of relevant articles, even if they are published in non-specialized journals. In the future, with the help of AI tools, impact might be defined more by the relevance than by the status of a journal.

P.127

A Naive Overview of Actors with a Mission or Relevance to Research Integrity

Mr. Bert Seghers[1]
[1]*European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Belgium*

Which organisations, initiatives and other players (i) have a role regarding research integrity; and (ii) have a global scope or reach? This poster attempts to visualise the most important actors in the author's view, although it is naive to reach completeness.
Other than the World Conferences on Research Integrity Foundation which organises this conference, other non-commercial initiatives with a dedicated mission in research integrity are scarce.
Today, research integrity is connected to neighbouring themes and action fields, such as (i) Research(er) assessment; (ii) Open Science & Reproducibility; (iii) Research Ethics; (iv) Academic Freedom; (v) Research Security; and (vi) a clean scientific record. Some of the actors in these action fields have done remarkable work related to research integrity.
Organisations may be representing the perspective (and be governed by) governments, funders, regulators or oversight bodies, scientists or research performing organisations, or publishers. The diagram orders the logos and names according to distinction criteria like field of action (previous paragraph) and role/sector/perspective (this paragraph).
The poster guides us past the WCRI(F), the International Science Council, the Global Research Council, UNESCO, the OECD, CoARA, DORA, IAP, INORMS, the Embassy of Good Science, NERQ, FORRT, COS/OSF, GRIOS and other notable open-science initiatives, Reproducibility Networks and their Global federation GFRN. It doesn't miss actors from the publishing sector, which is global by design: COPE, ICMJE, STM and its Integrity Hub, United2Act, and also mentions PubPeer, Retraction Watch and its retraction database curated by Crossref.
This poster builds on previous mapping work (presented at the European Congress for Research Integrity in Ljubljana, September 2025), focusing on actors in Europe.
The author is happy to annotate the chart upon request, explaining the role of each of the institutions depicted, and receive feedback on gaps.

P.129

Reflections on ChatGPT-Assisted English Communication Practice: Fairness, Transparency, and Ethical Considerations among Thai Pharmacy Students

Dr. Dujrudee Chinwong[1], *Dr. Surarong Chinwong*[1]
[1]*Faculty of Pharmacy, Chiang Mai University, Thailand*

Introduction
As artificial intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly integrated into health professions education, questions of fairness, transparency, and ethical responsibility have become central to educational and research integrity. This study explored pharmacy students' reflections on using ChatGPT for English communication practice simulating pharmacist–patient interactions and examined how such use relates to integrity in professional training.

Methods
Fourteen fourth- and fifth-year pharmacy students participated in a class discussion following AI-supported activities in an English Communication for Pharmacy course in second semester (November 2024 to February 2025). These activities included patient counseling in drugstore settings, patient education in English, patient interviews for common illnesses, and health counseling using special techniques. Researchers documented field notes and synthesized students' reflections. Three key themes emerged inductively from the discussion: fairness of access, perceived reliability and transparency of AI responses, and ethical appropriateness in communication training.

Results
Students viewed ChatGPT as a valuable and flexible tool that enhanced their confidence and communication skills. Many appreciated AI's ability to provide unlimited practice opportunities, enable self-paced learning, and adjust task complexity according to language proficiency, encouraging greater self-efficacy before real patient encounters. However, several integrity-related concerns were raised. Regarding fairness of access, some reported unequal opportunities due to unstable internet, limited device access, or restricted use of the premium version. Differences in digital literacy and prompt-writing skills also led to varied learning experiences. Under reliability and transparency, students noted inconsistent responses and uncertainty about how answers were generated, which affected their trust in AI. Regarding ethical appropriateness, students reflected that practicing with AI-simulated patients did not help them feel the same empathy and emotional connection as when interacting with real people, leading them to question whether such practice fully supports the development of patient-centered communication skills.

Conclusion
This study shows both the benefits and challenges of using AI in professional education. While ChatGPT can support flexible and confident learning, it also raises concerns about fairness, reliability, and ethics. Promoting trust and transparency in AI-assisted learning will help ensure that technology is used responsibly and supports integrity in education.

P.131

From Virtue (Arete) to Ubuntu: Indigenizing Research Integrity Across Greece and South Africa

Dr. Eleni Spyrakou[1], *Ms Eleni Flack-Davison*[2]
[1]*National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece,* [2]*University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa*

Background and Objectives
Research integrity is often presented as a universal ideal, yet its expression is shaped by diverse cultural, philosophical, and institutional traditions. This study explores how indigenous ways of being and regionally grounded ethical frameworks inform institutional approaches to responsible research within and between Greece, South Africa, and the broader contexts of the European Union (EU) and African Union (AU). The objective is to identify how local philosophies of integrity rooted in ancient, communal, and relational understandings of knowledge can enrich global approaches to research integrity. The study aims to reimagine integrity not merely as compliance, but as an evolving ethic of care, collective accountability, and shared human purpose.

Methodology
Using a comparative qualitative design, the study examines institutional practices, national and international frameworks, and cultural paradigms underpinning research integrity across the EU and AU contexts. Data include policy analysis, and reflective dialogues between scholars and administrators. Special attention is given to two key philosophical lineages: the Greek ethos of arete (virtue and moral excellence) as a foundation for scholarly conduct, and the African philosophy of Ubuntu, emphasizing interdependence, relational accountability, and harmony within the research community. The analysis explores how these value systems interact with European and African governance structures to shape responsible research cultures.

Preliminary Findings
Preliminary results suggest convergence in aspirations for ethical excellence, transparency, and trust, but divergence in how integrity is operationalized. In Greece and the EU, virtue ethics and philosophical reasoning guide institutional reflection; in South Africa and the AU, communal and restorative ethics drive engagement and responsibility. Challenges include reconciling globally standardized norms with regionally embedded epistemologies, limited capacity for integrity training, and uneven institutional prioritization.

Conclusion
Indigenizing research integrity through European and African lenses demonstrates that cultural diversity strengthens, rather than fragments, global ethical standards. Integrating Arete and Ubuntu as complementary ethical foundations can foster a globally resonant yet locally grounded integrity culture.

P.133

Navigating Multi-Jurisdictional Cases

Ms. Christine Snidal[1], ***Dr. MICHAEL MAZZULLA***[1]
[1]*University Health Network, Toronto, Canada*

University Health Network (UHN) is Canada's largest research hospital and is affiliated with the University of Toronto. Principal investigators (PIs) conducting research at UHN hold appointments at the University of Toronto, and many PIs are cross appointed at other Toronto research hospitals. UHN is engaged in numerous studies that take place across institutions. This collaboration promotes cutting edge health research, but it can create complicated jurisdictional situations.

Here we present three case studies that highlight the complexities of navigating multi-jurisdictional research integrity cases. Through these examples, we aim to highlight key issues including: establishing the lead institution, planning for communication and reporting across institutions, confidentiality, decision-making around sanctions, and pre-negotiating expectations in collaboration agreements to avoid disputes. We also provide key considerations for institutions to help address these complexities.

Our research integrity team worked closely with legal and integrity teams across institutions to develop strategies to navigate the complex jurisdiction of the three cases presented here.

(1) An allegation was made against a member of a research team conducting a multi-site study that was approved and primarily conducted at one institution, with specific study activities taking place at a partner institution. The respondent was affiliated only with the partner institution. While jurisdiction for the research integrity complaint rested with the partner institution, both institutions reviewed non-research integrity related conduct.

(2) An allegation was made regarding a study that involved biospecimens collected at a primary institution and shared with a partner institution. The allegation was related to research conducted using these samples at the partner institution, and the partner institution assumed jurisdiction over the investigation. The primary institution conducted a review of the samples and certain information about the investigation was shared with the primary institution.

(3) An allegation was made regarding work published in the thesis of a university graduate student. The research in question was conducted at an affiliated hospital, which is not a degree-conferring institution. Graduate students receive their degree from the university. As the research was conducted at the hospital, the hospital conducted the investigation. The decision about sanctions or remedial action rested with the university.

P.135

Bridging the Gap: Translating and Validating the Road2Openness Assessment Tool for the Brazilian Research Community

Prof. Rafaelly Stavale[1,2], *Dr. Verena Heise*[3], *Dr. Damian Paderta*[4], *Dr. Luciana Machado*[2]
[1]*Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Brazil,* [2]*Science Integrity Alliance, USA,* [3]*Freelance Open Science consultant/ trainer/ researcher, Germany,* [4]*NOZILLA, Germany*

Objective
This project reports on the translation and cultural adaptation of the Road2Openness self-assessment tool (https://road2openness.de/en/) to Brazilian Portuguese. We aim to provide a linguistically and contextually validated instrument to help Brazilian institutions evaluate and enhance their open science practices, fostering a more transparent research ecosystem and bridging the current gap in available local resources.

Methods
The initial phase involved an artificial intelligence (AI)-powered translation of the Road2Openness tool into Brazilian Portuguese. This AI-generated translation underwent rigorous assessment by a professional human translator using a structured approach for back-translation and proofreading. In the next phase, the translated instrument will be piloted with key local experts to gather feedback for final conceptual and semantic validation. The tool will be made available online for user-friendly accessibility and data collection.

Results
This project will produce a fully translated and validated Brazilian Portuguese version of the Road2Openness tool, ready for implementation by research institutions across Brazil. We will present a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic and cultural adaptations made, highlighting key terminological challenges and their resolutions, alongside preliminary findings from the pilot study with local experts, including qualitative feedback on the instrument's clarity, relevance, and cultural appropriateness. By the time of the conference, we will have completed this pilot phase and will share the final validated instrument and complete findings from the expert feedback sessions.

Conclusion
The successful translation and validation of the Road2Openness tool will offer Brazilian institutions an instrument for self-assessment and improvement of open science practices. While the initial pilot is limited to a network of experts, it will provide insights into the translated instrument's clarity, cultural appropriateness, and practical applicability within the Brazilian research context, establishing a foundation for broader implementation.

P.137

Open Science Workshop in Cardiology Research: An Experience Report

Sr. Rozemberg Falcão E Silva Alves[1], *Mrs. Iara Machado*[1], *Sr. Gustavo Fernandes Lima*[1], *PhD Dirce Bellezi Guilhem*[1], *Prof. Rafaelly Stavale*[1,2,3,4]

[1]*University Of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil,* [2]*Federal University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil,* [3]*Science Integrity Alliance, Sunrise, USA,* [4]*Brazilian Reproducibility Network, Brasília, Brazil*

Objective
To describe and evaluate a student-led, gamified workshop designed to introduce Open Science principles to early-career health professionals in cardiology.

Method
This is an experience report. We designed and delivered a 90-minute interactive workshop to a multidisciplinary audience at a cardiology symposium promoted by the Institute of Cardiology and Transplantation of the Federal District, Brazil. The content covered the historical and conceptual basis of Open Science, its practical application in cardiology, ethical considerations, and available tools. A key pedagogical feature was a gamification strategy using an interactive quiz to enhance engagement and knowledge retention. The workshop's effectiveness and reception were assessed using a post-activity unanimous evaluation questionnaire with both closed and open-ended qualitative feedback.

Results
Fifteen people participated in the activity, including health science professionals (n=9) and residents in cardiology (n=6). Initially, the workshop began with a historical and conceptual introduction to Open Science, followed by a discussion on its application in cardiology, addressing real-world cases, ethical dilemmas, tools, repositories, and funding policies related to the topic. To encourage engagement, a gamification strategy was used, featuring an interactive activity through a quiz on the subject. The activity fostered a space for debate and reflection, including a question-and-answer session, recommendations for complementary materials, and encouragement for the practical application of Open Science principles. A primary finding during the debate was that 93.3% (n=14) reported no prior exposure to Open Science. We obtained a response rate of 40% (n=6) of the evaluation questionnaire. All participants revealed satisfaction with the topic's contribution to their professional practice; as well as rated the resources used in the presentation as excellent. In the open-ended comments, positive feedback highlighted the clarity, public speaking skills, and preparation of the facilitators, as well as the discussion's impact on offering new perspectives on scientific practice.

Conclusion
This student-led initiative demonstrates that gamified, interactive workshops are a highly effective and well-received method for introducing open science concepts. The identified knowledge gap underscores the urgent need to formally integrate Open Science training into health sciences curricula for several career stages.

P.139

Advancing Reproducibility: Taking Lessons From iRISE, TIER2, and OSIRIS Forward Under the MERRI Collaboration

Dr. Inge Stegeman[1], *Rachel Heyard*[2], *Dr. Gillian Currie*[3], *Dr. Tony Ross - Hellauer*[4]
[1]*Umc Utrecht, Netherlands,* [2]*Center for Reproducible Science and Research Synthesis, University of Zurich,* [3]*University of Edinburgh,* [4]*KNOW Center*

Reproducibility is a core aspect of valuable research. Despite progress in fostering open science and rigorous research practices, challenges remain in assessing the impact of interventions to improve reproducibility, prioritizing effective strategies, and integrating reproducibility initiatives across disciplines. The MERRI (MEta-Research for Research Improvement) collaboration brings together three major European reproducibility consortia—iRISE, TIER2, and OSIRIS—to advance research reproducibility, rigor and integrity. In this session we will reflect on key insights from the three consortia and discuss priorities for future efforts in meta-research on reproducibility. The session will explore lessons learned from each consortium, highlighting evidence-based approaches to improving research transparency, data sharing, and methodological rigor. Attendees will be invited to contribute perspectives on the most pressing challenges and opportunities, as MERRI aims to build a more coordinated and effective approach to strengthening research integrity and reproducibility.

P.141

Vast Published Misinformation Regarding Parental Alienation

*Dr. William Bernet[1], **Dr. Lynn Steinberg**[1]*
[1]Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, USA, [2]University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

Objective
We have known for years that repeated misinformation regarding parental alienation theory has appeared in journal articles, book chapters, scholarly presentations, and legal documents. We proposed to search the parental alienation literature to determine (1) the types of misinformation that have occurred and (2) whether the misinformation was subsequently corrected or refuted.

Methods
We searched the parental alienation literature, conference presentations, and pertinent legal cases to identify examples of various types of misinformation. We determined whether or not the misinformation was subsequently corrected or edited. We used citation analysis to identify patterns of recurrent misinformation that occurred over many years.

Results
We identified the following types of misinformation: (1) blatant ad hominem attacks against proponents of parental alienation theory; (2) straw man arguments that misrepresented parental alienation theory and then criticized the mistaken version of the theory; (3) misquotations of articles and chapters previously published by proponents of parental alienation theory; (4) lack of knowledge of fundamental features of parental alienation theory; (5) sloppy research and writing skills, such as relying and secondary and tertiary sources rather than primary sources of information; (6) anti-parental alienation bias manifested by confirmation bias; and (7) explicit anti-parental alienation opinions of journal editors. Using citation analysis, we identified a pattern in which the same misinformation was repeated in professional literature and presentations more than 100 times over 30 years. At times, the parental alienation misinformation was refuted, for example, by publishing a clarifying article in the same journal that published the original article. At times, incorrect statements regarding parental alienation theory were corrected in the online version of the published article.

Conclusions
Misinformation is a serious phenomenon that damages research and other scholarship regarding parental alienation theory. This proliferation of misinformation in journal articles and presentations at professional meetings compromises the ability of mental health and legal trainees and practitioners to learn correct, evidence-based information regarding this topic. Most significantly, we are concerned that misinformation may be introduced into legal proceedings through faulty expert testimony and then incorporated into flawed conclusions by judges.

P.143

Identifying Potential Falsified Research Outcomes from Partial Table Duplications

Mr. Pawin Taechoyotin[1], *Dr. Daniel Acuna*[1,2]
[1]*University Of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA,* [2]*ReviewerZero AI, Inc, Broomfield, USA*

Objective
Previous research has shown that figure and text duplication or edits are one of the possible symptoms of falsified results. Tables are an essential part of a research publication, but have not been explored to the same extent. This study aims to identify partial table duplication across research publications.

Method
This study analyzed tables included in papers from the PubMed Open Access Database. The duplicated cells were identified via an exact match of cell values and grouped by the source of such cells. Only cells with numerical values were considered since values such as table headers, column names, dataset names, and model names could be shared as standard experiment settings. Additionally, we performed zero-shot prompting to an LLM to judge whether the duplication is considered problematic.

Results
This analysis covered 14 million tables across 6 million papers. Of the tables analyzed, 49.79% ($n \approx 7$ million) share three cell values, 40% ($n \approx 5.6$ million) share four cell values, and 33% ($n \approx 4.6$ million) share five cell values. At the paper level, 70% ($n = 4.2$ million) share three cell values, 65% ($n = 3.9$ million) share four cell values, and 60% ($n \approx 3.6$ million) share five cell values. Additionally, the analysis indicated that a table that has shared values has a probability of being flagged as problematic, $p=0.035 \pm 0.022$ (95 % CI).

Conclusion
This study provides an insight into partial duplication of tables, which is an essential part of many research publications. Although the problematic duplications are rare, an instance of such falsified results could lead to dire consequences, such as invalidation of subsequent publications and well-established theories.

P.145

Measuring Open Research Practices Using Methods That Have High Research Integrity

*Dr. Neil Jacobs[1], Dr Alice Howarth[2], **Dr. Jackie Thompson**[1,3]*
[1]Uk Reproducibility Network / University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom, [2]University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom, [3]University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

Objective
Open research practices are widely promoted as key to research integrity, yet their actual prevalence remains unclear due to methodological and data limitations. This study aimed to develop and implement a rigorous, scalable, and repeatable survey methodology to assess the prevalence of a broad range of open research practices across UK institutions.

Methods
Conducted as part of the UK Reproducibility Network Open Research Programme, the survey was embedded in a broader evaluation framework linking interventions, engagement, and indicators. The instrument was adapted from the internationally validated Brief Open Research Survey (BORS), with stratified sampling based on national datasets to ensure representativeness. Implementation was locally led but centrally coordinated across 20 UK institutions. Open R scripts were developed for transparent analysis.

Results
We report both on the methodological achievements and the survey findings. The coordinated deployment across diverse institutions demonstrated that a shared instrument and sampling frame can yield representative data across disciplines and career stages. However, this required significant planning and central support.
Survey results showed that among 13 open research practices, pre-registration and FAIR data had the lowest awareness and use—particularly surprising for FAIR data, given the contrast with higher awareness of open data. Practices such as citizen science, open code, and replication studies showed high awareness but lower use, with disciplinary variation. Quantitative researchers reported greater use of most practices, except for research co-production, which was more common among qualitative researchers.

Attitudes toward open research were generally positive. Most respondents felt confident in their understanding and use of open practices, but uptake remains limited—only 7% reported using them to their full potential. Few respondents had seen open research in job assessment criteria. Enabling factors such as training, time, incentives, and infrastructure received moderate support, with patterns of prioritisation differing by discipline and career level.

Conclusions
This study demonstrates a rigorous and scalable method for assessing open research practices and the results highlight key prevalence measures and disciplinary and methodological differences. The open dataset and analysis scripts can help institutions and policymakers to design targeted, evidence-informed interventions to foster a culture of research integrity.

P.147

Synthesis and Recommendations from the TIER2-Project: Towards Promoting Reproducibility Practices in Different Epistemic Contexts: Results from Implementing Eight Tools and Reproducibility-Promoting Practices for Researchers, Funders, and Publishers

Dr Tony Ross-Hellauer, ***Dr. Joeri Tijdink***
[1]Amsterdam Umc, Location Vumc, Netherlands, [2]TIER2-project, Amsterdam, Nederland

Objective
The lack of reproducibility in research results has become a major concern in recent years. Poor research quality, economic pressures, and declining societal trust in science make improving reproducibility an urgent priority. TIER2 is an EU-funded project that brings together diverse epistemic contexts (including the social sciences and computer sciences), research funders, and publishers to investigate and enhance reproducibility systematically.

Methods
Over a period of three years, we developed a broad range of outputs: comprehensive reviews, a theoretical framework on knowledge production modes, autoethnographic studies, and the testing of eight distinct tools and interventions designed to promote reproducibility practices (RPs).

Results
Under TIER2, we implemented eight pilot interventions across researchers, funders, and publishers to test ways of increasing reproducibility. For researchers, we piloted (1) the Decision Aid to clarify when and how reproducibility is feasible; (2) a Reproducibility Management Plan (RMP) tool embedded in research planning workflows; (3) Reproducible Workflows, adapting SCHEMA and containerization tools for life and computational sciences; and (4) Reproducibility Checklists for Computational Social Science, with templates for planning, analysis, and sharing.

For funders, we created and piloted (5) a Reproducibility Promotion Plan, providing guidelines for funders to enhacen RPs, and (6) a Reproducibility Monitoring Dashboard to enable funders to track reuse.

For publishers, we initiated (7) Editorial Workflows to increase Data Sharing, including a randomized intervention on data availability statements, and (8) an Editorial Reference Handbook for Reproducibility, co-created with major publishers to define standardized review checks.

While each pilot was designed for a specific stakeholder group, several are now being adopted more broadly: e.g. the promotion plan is also tested in an RPO. From these pilots, we formulated six recommendations to strengthen reproducibility across different research contexts, providing a robust evidence base to inform researchers, institutions, funders, publishers, and policymakers.

Conclusion
By engaging researchers, publishers, and funders, and by offering concrete, implementable recommendations and promotion plans, TIER2 contributes practical solutions to enhance the overall quality and trustworthiness of research in the global R&I ecosystem. Strengthening reproducibility is essential for restoring trust, promoting integrity, and improving the efficiency and societal value of science.

P.149

The Intersection of Socio-Cultural Factors and Research Integrity Practices in Africa

Dr. Solange Swiri Tumasang[1]
[1]*University of Maroua, Maroua, Cameroon*

Objective
This study examines the intersection of socio-cultural factors and research integrity practices in Africa, aiming to identify challenges and opportunities for promoting research integrity. It seeks to understand how cultural norms and power dynamics influence research practices and integrity in African settings.

Method
This qualitative study involved in-depth interviews with 50 researchers and stakeholders from various African countries. The interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns and themes related to research integrity practices, ensuring data saturation and rigorous coding procedures were employed

Results
The findings reveal complex relationships between cultural norms, power dynamics, and research practices. Specifically, 80% of participants reported that cultural values such as communalism can foster collaboration and knowledge-sharing, but also lead to authorship disputes and unfair distribution of credit. Additionally, 75% of participants indicated that respect for authority can hinder research integrity, particularly in hierarchical relationships between supervisors and students. Furthermore, 90% of participants emphasized the need for culturally sensitive research ethics training, and 85% highlighted the importance of mentorship programs and policies that account for local contexts. The study's thematic analysis identified three key themes: cultural values and research integrity, power dynamics and research practices, and contextualizing research integrity in African settings. These themes were inductively derived from the data, reflecting the nuanced and context-specific nature of research integrity in African settings. Based on these findings, it is recommended that research institutions prioritize culturally sensitive approaches to promote research integrity.

Conclusion
This study underscores the importance of nuanced approaches to research integrity that account for the complexities of African contexts. It emphasizes the need for research institutions in Africa to prioritize building research capacity, promoting transparency, and fostering a culture of research integrity. The findings contribute to the global conversation on promoting research integrity and advancing responsible research practices.

P.151

Supporting Senior Researchers to Be Ethical Supervisors And Responsible Team Leaders: Bridging Academic Pressures and Research Integrity

Dr. Susanne van den Hooff[1]
[1]*University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands*

Background
Senior researchers play a crucial role in ensuring research integrity within their teams, as emphasized in the ALLEA European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023). Their responsibilities include mentoring junior researchers, preventing misconduct, and fostering a positive research culture. However, the increasing pressures of academic competition and the “publish or perish” culture can make it difficult to balance ethical responsibilities with institutional performance demands.

Objective
This study examines how senior researchers perceive and fulfill their professional responsibilities in accordance with the ALLEA Code, and identifies ways in which the academic community and policymakers can better support them in fulfilling these ethical obligations.

Methods
A qualitative analysis was conducted of the literature and discussions among research integrity professionals. Key themes were identified regarding challenges faced by senior researchers and strategies to strengthen ethical leadership in research teams.

Results
Senior researchers can experience high stress due to conflicting demands between ensuring good scientific practice and meeting publication expectations. This tension may, in some cases, contribute to poor supervision or misuse of power. Misuse of power in academic settings manifests in several potentially harmful ways, particularly affecting early-career researchers. Participants emphasized the need for targeted support mechanisms, including leadership training, better employment conditions, and promotion of a “slow science” approach that prioritizes research quality over quantity.

Conclusions
Supporting senior researchers through institutional training, improved job security, and recognition of the quality of mentorship can foster healthier research environments. Encouraging slow science and responsible supervision may help prevent misconduct and strengthen integrity across the academic ecosystem.

P.153

What Is the Role of Confidential Counselors for Research Integrity?

Dr. Anna Van 't Veer[1], *Wilbert Spooren*[2], *Mariam van Loon*[3], *Dr. Rita Alves Dos Santos*[4]
[1]*Leiden University, Methodology and Statistics in Psychology, Netherlands,* [2]*Radboud Universiteit, Netherlands,* [3]*Amsterdam University Medical Center, Netherlands,* [4]*Netherlands Research Integrity Network, Netherlands*

There are many entry points where we can collectively facilitate research to be conducted and reported with integrity, such as codes of conduct, (ethical) committees, pre-and post publication peer-reviews and responsibilities of institutions to foster healthy research cultures. In several of these places, the role of Confidential Counselor for Research Integrity is an important one: next to their advising and signalling function to the institution, confidential counselors are there for anyone to consult–in confidence–about possible grey areas and dilemmas. Everyone has the right to this kind of counsel from someone who stands next to them without judgment or conflicts of interest, and without information leaving the room unless there are overruling reasons to break confidentiality such as a severe moral dilemma for the counselor. However, the role description and level of independence of confidential counselors is not standardized across institutions and this may hinder the process and the structures in place for dealing with (violations of) research integrity.
We therefore discuss different viewpoints and a comparative analysis of policy documents to see which variations in this role exist. For instance, when it comes to disagreement on what is good practice, does the Confidential Counselors for Research Integrity mediate between parties? And does their contract provide them with protection against management asking them to breach confidentiality?
In the current project, we synthesize discussions on these themes within our Netherlands Research Integrity Network (NRIN)'s national group of Dutch Confidential Counselors for Research Integrity, and gathered over 25 policy documents from over 15 different institutions across the Netherlands via this network for document analysis. Documents include for instance complaints routes or (internal) job descriptions that speak to the role of confidential counselors in different institutions in the Netherlands.
We discuss the differences and similarities we found regarding the role of Confidential Counselors, take our lessons learned to a broader international perspective, and open up thought provoking questions to the poster audience about what role Confidential Counselors can and should be fulfilling in supporting research integrity.

P.155

Why Asking for Transparency Is Simply Not Enough in an Age of Generative AI

Ms. Marijke Van Vlasselaer[1], *Prof Filip Van Droogenbroeck*[1], *Prof Bram Spruyt*[1], *Prof. Gustaaf Cornelis*
[1]*Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium*

Many universities require students to disclose their use of generative AI (GenAI) in academic work. The concept of transparency has become key in policies that ask for disclosure. Yet, the meaning of "transparency" and how it can be demonstrated remains unclear. This study looks at the gap between students' self-reported GenAI use, the transparency statements included in their master's theses, and institutional policy frameworks from European higher education institutions governing the disclosure of GenAI.

This study examines two questions: (1) How do students' GenAI statements in their master's theses compare to the AI prompts and outputs they shared as evidence of their use? (2) And to what extent do university policies on transparency align with these students' practices?

Using a qualitative design, the research combines different data sources: (1) a student survey (N = 223), (2) thesis transparency statements on GenAI, (3) students' shared AI prompts and generated outputs, and (4) GenAI policy documents from 28 European universities. All materials were analysed using a coding framework based on the FAIR data principles.

Data collection and analysis are still in progress. Early analysis suggests that students' transparency statements are often vague. The prompts and outputs that students shared as evidence often add little more disclosure: in many cases, only one or two generic prompts were provided. This underlines a sort of illusion of transparency, where students appear to follow the rules but their disclosures remain superficial and unverifiable. Applying the FAIR data principles shows that most statements are findable but not reusable. Institutional policies, while asking for transparent use, rarely specify how GenAI output should be documented.

Transparency in its current form has become a formality rather than a good practice of academic integrity. Students disclose, but what they show is too vague to be useful. The challenge is not that students resist disclosure, but maybe that institutions mistake disclosure for understanding. Real transparency would make the process visible, not just the outcome.

Keywords: transparency generative AI higher education
academic integrity AI policy

P.157

Are We Ready for a Data-Driven Era? Building the Foundations for Reliable and Reusable Data

Dr. Anna Catharina Vieira Armond[1], *Prof David Moher*[2,3], *Dr Kelly Cobey*[1,3]
[1]*University Of Ottawa Heart Institute, Ottawa, Canada,* [2]*Centre for Journalology, Methodological and Implementation Research Program, Ottawa, Canada,* [3]*School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada*

Well-managed and well-documented data are critical to advancing trustworthy and reusable science. Yet, despite growing policy attention, data management and sharing practices remain fragmented and poorly supported. In this talk, we will describe a research program addressing this gap by generating empirical evidence, developing practical tools, and fostering consensus to strengthen data practices across the research lifecycle in biomedical research.

As part of this initiative, we conducted a scoping review of the global policy landscape, analyzing data management and sharing requirements from major biomedical research funders. This study showed a significant variability in expectations, levels of detail, and monitoring mechanisms, highlighting the need for more coherent and harmonized guidance.

Building on these insights, we set our focus on developing evidence-based tools to support data management and sharing. First, we developed evidence-based Data Management Plan (DMP) templates tailored to randomized controlled trials. Through iterative user testing with trialists, the template was refined to ensure clarity and feasibility for teams without dedicated data management support. This tool serves as a prototype for future DMP resources; we're currently working on validating design-specific DMPs for systematic review studies, genomics research, and preclinical research; context-specific DMPs that are evidence-based are more likely to resonate with the distinct research communities.

Second, complementing these efforts, we have just started to develop a consensus-building initiative to define the key elements that should be reported about data practices in biomedical research, with an initial focus on clinical trials. This work aims to establish what information is needed to ensure transparency and foster data quality, reusability, and adherence to FAIR principles, and to inform future standards and guidance.

This presentation will provide an integrated overview of these initiatives, highlighting the tools and frameworks developed and opening a discussion on critical gaps that remain. Aligning expectations across stakeholders, improving data quality, and creating sustainable infrastructures and incentives are essential steps if the biomedical research community is to build a trustworthy and reusable evidence base in the data-driven era.

P.159

Protecting Science from Foreign Interference: Toward A Joint Approach by Research Integrity & Research Security Communities

Dr. Nathalie Voarino[1], *Dr. Romain Pierronnet*[1]
[1]*French Office for Research Integrity, Paris, France*

We propose to discuss here the challenges and possible solutions to the implementation of a joint approach by the research integrity (RI) and research security (RS) communities in tackling foreign interference in research. In a changing geopolitical context, concerns about foreign interference in research are growing. Increasingly, the RI community is invited to help counter these threats, which have traditionally fallen under the remit of RS activities. However, in France, RI and RS have until now been addressed separately, involving different actors and different control and prevention mechanisms at both the national and local level.

In this context, the French Office for Research Integrity has undertaken prospective work in order to: 1) identify whether the various forms of foreign interference pose risks to RI; 2) map the scope of the current RS framework and its potential gaps. We identified several threats to RI — i.e. situations where foreign states or third parties hinder the reliability of results and the proper functioning of research communities – occurring through deception, discrediting, or coercion of various research actors. We also identified several gaps in the current French RS framework, such as:

- Misaddressing of social sciences cases –the framework is technology-oriented, mainly dedicated to very high risk of knowledge and expertise capture for disciplines with potential military applications;
- Misaddressing of research integrity threats – built from a counterintelligence perspective, the framework was not designed to deal with such issues;
- Lack of acceptance – security measures can generate reluctance in some research communities (i.e., concerns relate to bureaucratic burdens, overly restrictive measures and suspicions regarding the involvement of non-academic actors in research governance).

We argue that a joint approach by the RS and the RI communities is necessary in France, in line with the recommendations of several international reports (G7 SIGRE, OECD, EU), to better respond to foreign interference. The complementarity between the two communities may help to find the right balance between excessive measures that would impede academic freedom and knowledge production and insufficient measures that fail to respond adequately to the sophistication and scale of foreign interference threats.

P.161

Truth in the Tags: Metadata as a Defense Against AI Manipulation

Dr. Manisha Wadhwa[1]
[1]*SpringerNature, Heidelberg, Germany*

As artificial intelligence (AI) tools and large language models become more accessible and technologically advanced, their integration in academic publishing is accelerating and becoming increasingly harder to detect. In the first half of 2025 alone, 77 cases of submitted and published articles were reported in which the use of AI tools was suspected, either by authors or flagged by reviewers during peer review. Despite clear policies from major publishers such as Elsevier, Wiley, and Springer Nature requiring disclosure of AI use, many authors and reviewers fail to comply. This noncompliance presents a growing challenge for editors, publishers, and Research Integrity Advisors in distinguishing legitimate AI assistance from unethical content generation.

Investigations into these cases revealed recurring issues, including hallucinated references, incoherent or nonsensical text, generic language lacking domain-specific nuance, and fabricated data or images. This abstract highlights two such cases. In one, published images were suspected to be AI-generated, accompanied by incoherent text. In the other, hallucinated references raised concerns about the use of large language models for full-text generation.

However, detailed metadata analysis clarified both situations. In the first case, raw image files with timestamps and instrument logs confirmed the images were authentic. In the second, forensic review of the manuscript's metadata revealed that AI tools were used solely for formatting references. In both cases, metadata—such as timestamps, tool usage logs, version histories, and instrument data—was essential in tracing content origins and distinguishing between formatting assistance and full-scale fabrication. This distinction was pivotal in making an informed editorial decision to issue corrections rather than retractions.

In an AI-driven publishing landscape, metadata plays a critical role in ensuring transparency and accountability. It provides detailed insight into how manuscripts are created and revised, helping detect anomalies and support editorial decisions. To harness metadata effectively, publishers must implement standardised protocols for capturing and reviewing AI tool usage disclosures at the time of submission.

P.163

Complexities in Investigating Post-Publication Image Integrity Concerns in 'Historic' Content

Dr. Olufolake (Fulu) Akinduro-aje[1], ***Mrs. Laura Wilson***[1]
[1]*Taylor & Francis, United Kingdom*

Publishers and journals are committed to investigating concerns raised about journal articles in a timely manner. Concerns regarding an article may be raised at any point post-publication. For this study, a 'historic' article is considered older than 8 years. With the use of tools like ImageTwin, Taylor & Francis have seen an increase in articles raised by sleuths for image integrity concerns, many of which could be considered historic, with the oldest paper in the selected cohort described in this abstract dating back to 1994.
Investigations must be conducted in accordance with editorial policies and industry standards. Editors are concerned about investigating content they did not handle; with 'historic' content, there are further complexities.
When assessing 'historic' articles, journals must also consider historic data management practices and the conversion of hardcopies to digital formats, enabling the identification of mis-labelling and errors in historic datasets. The transition has identified irregularities due to image reshaping to fit on a print page or to conform with housestyle. These practices, whilst common at the time, are now unacceptable. Where image concerns are identified, authors are requested to provide their original images, but when the article is 'historic', authors are often unable to provide their original images.

Solution
T&F currently uses 4 types of post-publication notice; T&F has typically used Expressions of Concern (EoC) where an investigation will continue for some time, typically whilst we await an institutional response.
For cases involving historic articles with image issues where the concerns identified do not affect the overall validity of the study and its outcomes, but we are unable to conclude the investigation (due to an absence of original files), we have adopted an EoC notice as the final notice, in line with recent COPE guidelines.
These notices are published to make it clear that whilst a concern has been identified, based on current information, the Editor is confident that the integrity of the article remains.

Further action
Collaboration is needed between all stakeholders for guidelines on historic cases. If accepted, further data on the cohort will be presented at the conference.

P.165

Facilitating the Implementation of a Government Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) by and for Research Integrity Officers – The Quebec Approach

Ghislaine Cleret de Langavant, ***Madame. Raphaelle Stenne***[1]
[1]*Fonds de recherche du Québec, Montréal, Canada*

The implementation of the Quebec policy on responsible conduct of research is not always self-evident. Indeed, to respect specificities of the research ecosystems covered by this policy, its content is limited to describing, among other things, the values guiding rcr, the best practices in research, the essential elements of the process for managing an allegation of misconduct, and the respective responsibilities of stakeholders, including the organization that authored the policy. Consequently, research integrity officers (rio) in research ecosystems face various challenges, some of which are of an ethical nature, when managing allegations of rcr misconduct, sometimes even before an allegation is formulated. In response to a request made by rios, and with the desire to support them in this process, a guidance document with an educational, explanatory and reflective aim was drafted by an experienced retired rio. This document, prior to its recent publication, was subject to consultations to verify whether it is in tune with the reality and needs of the community concerned. This document is also intended to be an effective tool for peers responsible for the examination of rcr allegations; it aims to facilitate their understanding of the context in which their mandate is carried out and to promote a compliant, rigorous and effective examination. This document is expected to evolve in response to emerging concerns of rios and perhaps even to be adapted and used in different regulatory contexts.

P.02

Global Researchers' Integrity and Ethical Perspectives on the Integration of AI Tools in Their Research

Ms. Amani Abu-Shaheen[1], *MR Hashim Nofal*[3], *Dr. Muaawia Ahmed Hamza*[2], *Dr. Mohsen Ayyash*[4], *Dr. Ammara Awais*[5,6], *Mr Isamme Alfayyad*[1], *Kenan Alfayyad*[7]
[1]*Maastricht University, Netherlands,* [2]*Research Center, King Fahad Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia,* [3]*Al Alson International School, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia,* [4]*School of Mathematical Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, USM, Penang, Malaysia, Malaysia,* [5]*Bayes Business School, City St George's University, UK,* [6]*university of Lahore, Pakistan,* [7]*Al-Rissalah International School, Saudi Arabia*

Objective
There is an increasing adoption of AI tools in scientific and scholarly publications, which presents obvious changes in the research and academic fields. There is an escalating concern regarding the ethical dilemma that might develop due to the effect of these tools on the credibility and authenticity of research and scholarly work. The integration of AI tools in research settings requires an in-depth investigation to cover these emerging challenges, vigilant assessment, and regulations in the research and peer review processes to maintain the standards of scholarly work. Although the use of AI has been rising globally in the research field, there is a lack of empirical research studies regarding the integrity and ethical perspectives among researchers toward the use of AI tools, especially in the absence of ethically responsible policies in many countries. Thus, the aim of this study is to assess the global researchers' integrity and ethical perspectives on the integration of AI tools in their research work.

Methods
A global multicenter cross-sectional study will be conducted over one year at different hospitals, research centers, and universities across different countries in the world on researchers who published at least one article in a peer-reviewed journal in the last 3 years. The data will be collected using a validated self-administered questionnaire, which consists of three parts. The first part includes sociodemographic characteristics, previous training on AI, and the number of journal publications. The remaining two parts will assess the researchers' reported knowledge and practices of research integrity and ethical considerations for using AI tools in research. The practices section will be assessed through 13 questions regarding the use of AI tools and hypothetical case scenarios. An independent sample t-test and a one-way ANOVA will be executed for data analysis.

Results
The validity of the questionnaire completed and the data collection and analyses will be finalized in early April 2026, which will enable us to present the findings at the 9th WCRI.

Conclusion
The findings of this research project might be able to recommend the need for targeted interventions to promote the responsible use of AI to maintain research integrity.

P.06

The IP4OS Synergy Framework: Protocol-driven evidence and instruments for aligning IP and Open Science

Mrs. Marie Alavi[1], *Ms. Rebecca Fischer*[1]
[1]*Kiel University, Kiel, Germany*

The IP4OS Synergy Framework provides a practical, evidence-based manual for aligning Intellectual Property (IP) tools with Open Science (OS) practices across the research cycle. The Synergy Framework turns “as open as possible, as closed as necessary” into clear, step-by-step practices that align IP tools (e.g., licensing, rights retention, regulatory exclusivities) with Open Science across the research cycle. It gives diverse professions a shared, protocol-based playbook, reducing friction and conflicting advice while accelerating FAIR sharing and reuse of research outputs such as data, software, and publications. By using this framework, institutions can boost knowledge valorisation and compliance, strengthen trust and reproducibility, and convert research outputs into societal and economic impact with fitting tools.

The Synergy Framework’s development combined a) a protocolled scoping review of the IP–OS interface with b) a cross-sector survey of practitioners to surface tensions, map synergies, and distil implementable best practices for diverse research professions. Methodological foundations are openly described in two Zenodo protocols: a scoping review protocol detailing PRISMA-guided evidence identification, screening, and thematic analysis, and a survey protocol specifying the sampling frame, instrument design, data handling, and a mixed-methods analysis plan. (Sharma et al. 2025a, and Sharma et al. 2025b)
To enable transparency and reuse, IP4OS has made its empirical materials openly available. The survey dataset (Sharma and Nilsonne 2025a) includes fully de-identified REDCap exports plus a data dictionary to facilitate replicability and secondary analysis; the questionnaire file (Sharma and Nilsonne 2025b) provides the exact instrument used for fielding. Together, they support verification of findings, instrument adaptation, and local deployment for institutional benchmarking.
Drawing on this protocol,-anchored evidence-based, the Framework enumerates fitting IP tools (e.g., copyright and open-source licensing, time-sequenced regulatory exclusivities) and flags non-fitting choices (e.g., long-term secrecy in contexts requiring findability and reuse), pairing each with step-wise recommendations for researchers, KTT offices, data stewards, librarians, and legal counsel. The resulting guidance grounds the Synergy Core Curriculum and Training Centre, enabling European institutions to operationalise “as open as possible, as closed as necessary” in day-to-day decisions on publications, data, software, and know-how.

P.08

Retraction Trends in Engineering Research: A Two-Decade Retrospective Analysis

Dr. Suresh Baral[1]
[1]*School of Engineering, Pokhara University, Kaski, Pokhara, Nepal*

Objective
The objective of this study is to understand why engineering research has experienced a large number of retractions over the past two decades, raising concerns about research integrity. It also aims to identify the most affected subfields within engineering and to provide relevant recommendations for improving ethical and editorial practices.

Method
To achieve the research objective, a retrospective analysis was conducted on several retracted articles published across different publishing houses and databases. During the study, various search terms such as “retraction notice in engineering,” “retraction trends in engineering,” “research integrity in engineering,” and “data fabrication in engineering” were used to identify relevant publications. The collected data were then categorized into subdomains of engineering to determine the specific reasons for retraction. Furthermore, statistical tools were applied to assess the association between the causes and patterns of retractions.

Results
During the analysis, the highest number of retractions was observed for articles published from China, followed by Iran and India. This trend is largely attributed to the “publish or perish” pressure prevalent in academic and research institutions. Additionally, substantial funding is often allocated for publications, and financial bonuses for publishing in high-impact journals can incentivize unethical practices, leading to breaches of research integrity. The engineering subfields most affected by retractions were energy, materials, and computational modeling. In these areas, retractions were frequently associated with paper mills, peer-review manipulation, and fabricated experimental images or results, particularly in materials research. A notable finding is that some of these retracted papers had already been cited many times.

Conclusion
The retrospective analysis of the data reveals that engineering has shown an increasing trend in article retractions in recent years, even almost surpassing the medical and life sciences. The most affected subfields of engineering are thermal and energy engineering, materials science, and construction engineering. These findings highlight the urgent need for stricter research integrity practices to maintain credibility in engineering research.

P.10

Epistemologically Erasing Sustainability scholarships about historic Epistemological Erasures of Indigenous Biomedical Knowledge: a case of academic publishing malpractice, African Environmental Defenders v. Springer

Prof. Cecilia W Yu[1]
[1]*UNESCO Internet4trust knowledge Network, Vancouver, Canada*

This paper and its accompanying visual affiche, utilize a representative case of publishing malpractice within the process of global publications: the corporatized epistemological erasure of scholarly works that expose historic colonial epistemological erasures of Indigenous biomedical knowledge.
As universities and journals assert support for “decolonization” and “equity in knowledge production” the commercial reality within the information management of many commercial publishing firms, reveal an entrenched systemic bias that explicitly promulgate Disinformation targeting a number of Nobel winning Sustainability theories, UN Sustainability Development Goals, Environmental Human Rights litigations and UNESCO'S ratified international laws safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) (UNESCO, 2003). Major academic publishers such as Springer operates under a profit-driven predatory management feedback loop that appropriates and hoards intellectual property; repeatedly “soft” suppressing/censoring research that critically examines colonial Intellectual property (IP), appropriation of Indigenous TCH & ICH, particularly in biomedical visual arts featuring medicine, pharmacology, and anatomy.
My representative case explores editorial labor exploitations, selective corporatized insertion of commercial interest into the peer review process, and “commercial interests” based censorship. This research examines how corporate publishers act as neo-colonial suppliers/gatekeepers that determine which knowledge are “safe/profitable” for global consumption, thus undermining academic freedom through algorithmic and digital access censorship (Mahmut, 2024). By branding Indigenous epistemologies as “politically sensitive,” “editors lacking required expertise to assess", "audience unable to comprehend the topic", or “commercially risky" etc., in the flying face of Science, Historic Facts, Nobel winning theories and rigorous UN global peer reviews by some 1800 institutions, corporatized publishers replicate the same colonial power structures that historically dismissed Indigenous medical knowledge as “primitive superstitions", yet ripe for Intellectual copyright abuse and cultural appropriation and exploitation.
This paper situates such Malpractice within a broader exploitative economy; one that privileges global north intellectual property markets and academic censorships, negating field and experiment-based ontology at the core of the anarchic pillar of scientific methods, culminating in systemic, organized destructions of Indigenous authorship.
Drawing on critical discourse analysis of visual and digital ethnographies in the context of climate information integrity, the study argues that corporate publishing such as Springer’s modus operandi, presents grounds for anti-trust and human rights intervention (Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 2023). Their monopolistic control over biomedical and sustainability narratives constitutes a continuation of colonial extraction, now reframed through “brand management”, “public relations”, “author self-censorship” and threats of alleged “reputational risk” to authors and senior academics reviewers, in practice, a McCarthyism-like abuse of academic freedom and intellectual meritocracy.

The paper proposes Climate Information Integrity and Human Rights based legal interventions (Yu et al., 2025), in conjunction with super-macro UN climate information integrity and other macro-level transnational and national regulatory remedies, to enforce at a micro level, epistemic accountability. A crisis management strategy, disrupting Multi-national Enterprises (MNEs) abuse of sustainable Indigenous biomedical knowledge, targeting Sustainability and Climate disinformation (Internet4Trust, 2024), at the pre-publication stage that preference Corporate PR, collusions with Papermills for profit, and a systemically entrenched Malpractice that bias for profits over the Human Rights to Academic Freedom; preying on the unpaid labor of All Sustainability researchers from the global north and

south, many of whom struggle with “publish or perish” metrics that do not genuinely reflect the quality nor impact of their research (SF Dora, 2012).

Citations:

Business & Human Rights Resource Centre (2023) Germany: Axel Springer fires employee for allegedly questioning pro-Israel stance. Available at: https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/germany-axel-springer-fires-employee-for-allegedly-questioning-pro-israel-stance-amid-concerns-of-alleged-intensified-german-suppression-of-palestinian-voices-incl-co-comment/ (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

Mahmut, R. (2024) ‘Springer Nature, academic publishing, and the battle against Chinese censorship.’ The Spectator, 8 October. Available at: https://spectator.com/article/springer-nature-academic-publishing-and-the-battle-against-chinese-censorship/ (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) (2012) About DORA. Available at: https://sfdora.org/about-dora/ (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

UNESCO (2003) Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Available at: https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

UNESCO Internet for Trust Global Knowledge Network (2024) G20 Brasil 2024: G20 Maceió Ministerial Declaration on Digital Inclusion for All (Maceió, 13 September 2024). Paris: UNESCO. Available at: https://www.unesco.org (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

Yu, C. W., Okpabi, B. and Diolu, T. P. (2025) Corporate Crimes against Humanity (CCAH) in the Digital: Abuse of Information-Integrity in the Niger Delta v. Shell plc Environmental and Human Rights case. Niger Delta: LincGreen Sustainability Community Publisher. Available at: https://lincgreenprospects.org.ng/ccah/ (Accessed: 10 March 2026).

P.12

Shifting the Culture of Research Integrity: Utilizing Theories in Adult Education to Help Others Make the Shift

Dr. Tess Bird[1], *Dr. Angela Seggio - Welch*[2], *Dr. Jessica Pancholi*[3]
[1]*Research Integrity and Publication Ethics Center of Expertise, Elsevier, Cambridge, USA,* [2]*Research Integrity and Publication Ethics Center of Expertise, Elsevier, New York, USA,* [3]*Cell Press, Oxford, UK*

The publish or perish mentality of academia has caused some authors, reviewers, and even editors to engage in ethical misconduct aimed at inflating publication metrics. As a result of this climate, more and more journals face the challenge of addressing misconduct—such as citation manipulation or unauthorized authorship changes—and must continually review and update policies to match current trends. However, many editors and authors are not aware of the ethical pitfalls of certain behaviors and may be surprised by stricter policies. Publishers play an important role in protecting ethical standards and preventing misconduct by enacting policy, but after a new policy rolls out, they also face the challenge of educating the research community on necessary changes.

This poster argues that the publishing community should create educational materials that go beyond textual communication—or assuming researchers will "read this policy." We walk viewers through core theories in "andragogy," or adult learning, and share a case study that our Research Integrity and Publication Ethics team used to educate publishers and internal editors about a new change to our citation manipulation policy.

According to Malcolm Knowles' theory of andragogy, educational materials should be rooted in real, everyday experiences and workflows; have immediate relevance to our work; and be problem-centered rather than content-oriented. With these ideas in mind, we initiated an internal webinar series called In My Shoes where presenters walk attendees through real-life scenarios in publication ethics. As organizers, we help the presenters develop polls and quizzes so that the audience is inspired to interact with the content. Presentations are followed by a Q&A and discussion.

The poster will share the production and outcomes of a specific In My Shoes training on citation manipulation policies—specifically, self-citation in peer-review. We will share feedback from attendees and follow-up with publishers and editors about the usefulness of the training in understanding core changes to our policies as well as what they can do to address citation manipulation in their own journals. We conclude with our insights and suggest that similar styles of interactive, relevant education in universities and elsewhere can help foster a culture of research integrity.

P.16

The Effectiveness of Different Psychological E-mail Framings on Data Sharing: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Miss Barbara Ćaćić[1], *Assistant Professor Ivan Buljan*[1]
[1]*Faculty Of Humanities and Social Sciences, Split, Croatia*

Objective
Raw data sharing is a vital element of proper research practices. Previous research has shown that data sharing rates are low across multiple disciplines, and many researchers are hesitant to share their data for multiple reasons (Gopalakrishna et al., 2021). The present parallel randomized controlled trial focuses on psychological articles and assesses if any of the six approaches (neutral, social norms, empathy, self-enhancement, scientific values and potential for collaboration) are more successful in getting authors to share their raw data sets.

Methods
All empirical and review studies from the years 2022 until 2024 from 10 (five Q1 and five Q2) psychological journals will be extracted and included in the analysis; non-empirical publications (e.g. letters, commentaries, editorials) will be excluded. The corresponding authors' emails will be extracted from the included articles and randomized (through an online random number generator) to receive one of the six types of data requests (neutral, social norms, empathy, self-enhancement, scientific values and potential for collaboration). Two reminder emails will be sent, two weeks after each email to authors who do not respond to our requests. The study was preregistered on the OSF platform (https://osf.io/n5eqx).

Results
Data collection will be completed by February 2025. A Chi-square test of independence will be used to assess differences in data sharing rates as the primary outcome. Authors who receive the "Social Norm" type of data requests are expected to share their data more than other types of data requests.

Conclusions
The findings of this research could underline the need to further promote data sharing and provide guidance for researchers who request data sets from other researchers. Understanding which types of requests are more effective could help future authors in increasing their likelihood of receiving data.

P.18

Beyond the Tool: Teaching Responsible Use of AI in Chemistry Education

Dr. Yulia Sevryugina[1]
[1]*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA*

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming chemistry research, offering powerful tools for materials discovery, data analysis, and scientific communication. Recognizing both the benefits and the inevitability of AI adoption, as well as the importance of equipping future chemists with responsible AI literacy, we have integrated AI-assisted writing assignment into our chemistry curriculum. Our approach goes beyond simply introducing students to AI tools; it actively engages them in the critical evaluation of AI-generated content and the development of ethical research practices. To this end, we designed a series of scaffolded learning activities. First, a librarian-instructor delivers an informational lecture that introduces students to various AI tools, demonstrates their use, and highlights common pitfalls such as hallucinations, bias, and the risk of generating plausible yet false information. A librarian-instructor also describes strategies for recognizing, questioning, and improving AI outputs. In the second activity, students use prompts to interact with GenAI in creating a first draft of a GenAI-assisted essay on a selected chemistry topic. They then evaluate these outputs for scientific accuracy and depth of coverage. The third activity centers on reference evaluation, where students assess the credibility and relevance of sources generated by AI. This experience fosters informed skepticism, encourages discussion about reliability, and provides quantitative insights into the performance of various AI tools. Collectively, these activities instill core principles of research integrity, empowering students to harness AI responsibly and to act as critical gatekeepers in the scientific process. Our findings suggest that targeted education on the limitations and ethical considerations of AI is essential for enhancing students' judgment and commitment to responsible research practices.

P.20

Stop Publish or Perish! Findings from the Lithuanian National Survey on the Optimal Number of Publications to Publish across Scientific Fields

Dr. Reda Cimmperman, *Dr. Rima Sinickė*[1]
[1]*Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics And Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius, Lithuania*

Objective
This presentation outlines the results of a national survey conducted in 2025 among the academic community in Lithuania (lecturers, researchers, administration, doctoral students) from public and private universities, applied universities, colleges and research institutes.

Methods
A quantitative online survey was chosen to collect the data between December 2024 – January 2025. A total of 725 respondents participated in the survey. The results were analysed using descriptive statistical methods. The survey consisted of six different topics containing 48 quantitative items. This presentation covers the topic on writing and publishing scientific publications.

Results
Respondents were asked several questions, one of which was: “In your opinion, what would be the optimal number of scientific publications for a researcher in your field to produce/publish over a period of five years?”. Besides that, respondents had the opportunity to openly comment on their choice. This question received the most open responses compared to the other questions in the survey (151 open comments in total). This presentation covers comparative data by scientific fields, including the minimum, median, and maximum number of publications. In addition, the question included a sub-question about publications in high-level and lower-level journals, which will also be presented.

Conclusions
The median values range from 3 publications over five years in medicine, technology, and visual, performing, and screen arts, to 4 in natural sciences, and 5 in humanities and social sciences. After removing the largest outliers, the maximum number of publications ranges from 8 to 12 over five years (8 in performing and screen arts, 10 in visual arts, technology, medicine and health sciences, and natural sciences, and 12 in agriculture, social sciences, and humanities). Open comments and opinions provide a deeper insight into what lies behind the pressure to publish more.

P.22

Trust, Technology and Truth: AI through the Eyes of Academia

Dr. Reda Cimmperman[1], *Dr. Rima Sinickė*[1]
[1]*Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures, Vilnius, Lithuania*

Objective
Artificial intelligence (AI) is becoming part of research and academic life. This presentation shares how academic community in Lithuania see AI: what they expect from it, what they fear and how it affects research ethics?

Methods
In 2024, more than 700 people from universities and research institutions in Lithuania answered a national survey. They shared their views on trust in science, AI in education and research and possible problems AI might create. Their answers were analyzed and compared with current policies, our national Guidelines on the Ethical Use of AI in Education and Research (2024) and international discussions.

Results
Most respondents said that they trust in science. They trust individual scientists more than institutions. Research paid for by the government is seen as more trustworthy than private research. When asked about AI, opinions were mixed, many see AI as a helpful tool, for example, it can support researchers, improve writing and detect plagiarism or fake data. Others are worried. They think AI makes it easier to cheat, write fake papers or hide who really did the work. Some fear that students and staff are not using AI tools in an ethical way. Many institutions do not yet have clear rules or training about how to use AI in research and teaching. This makes the situation confusing and risky.

Conclusion
AI can support research integrity but it can also create problems if used the wrong way. Universities and research institutions need clear rules, better training and strong leadership to guide the use of AI. Trust in AI tools depends on how transparent, fair and ethical they are. Our survey shows that academics are ready to talk about these issues. Their voices should help shape future policies.

P.24

Mining Tortured Abbreviations from the Scientific Literature: From Filtering Rules to Language Models

Mr. Alexandre Clausse[1], *Prof. Guillaume Cabanac*[1,2], *Dr. Pascal Cuxac*[3], *Dr. Ophélie Fraisier-Vannier*[1], *Prof. Cyril Labbé*[4]

[1]*University Of Toulouse, IRIT UMR 5505, Toulouse, France,* [2]*Institut universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France,* [3]*INIST – CNRS, UAR76, Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France,* [4]*Grenoble Alpes University, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LIG, Grenoble, France*

Objective

The 'Tortured Abbreviations Miner' (TAM, WCRI'24, https://hal.science/hal-04311600) supports the human re-assessment of unreliable scientific articles. It detects tortured abbreviations: established scientific concepts paraphrased with synonyms, that do not match their abbreviation (e.g., 'Convolutional Brain Organisation (CNN)' for 'Convolutional Neural Network (CNN).') This abstract presents a new method based on language models to improve TAM performance through the identification and classification of all abbreviations from any given article.

Method

We built a test collection by sampling 150 tortured engineering articles in open access. The first author highlighted and extracted all abbreviations from each article. Each abbreviation was labelled as tortured or genuine. The first 75 articles come from the Problematic Paper Screener (PPS, WCRI'22, https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.04895) and have been used to develop the TAM classifier (80% to train, 10% to test, and 10% to validate language models). The next 75 articles were published by Hindawi (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10419036) and have been used to test the method in simulated conditions: 25 articles without any tortured abbreviation; the top 25 most tortured articles flagged by the PPS; and 25 randomly selected articles. We benchmarked the algorithm's output to compute recall and precision scores.

Results

The publicly released test collection (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14002956) contains 2,029 abbreviations including 680 tortured abbreviations. The improved TAM yields 53% precision and 72% recall, compared to the 61% precision and 27% recall in the previous version. Incremental failure analysis identifies false positives (e.g., examples given in brackets and references) and false negatives (i.e., matching acronym–initials yet irrelevant).

Conclusion

TAM allows the screening of incoming manuscripts or peer-reviewed articles to spot unreliable passages. Publishers are encouraged to add this screener in their editorial workflow, scientific sleuths can use it to screen articles for post-publication review. We welcome developers to use the test collection to benchmark their own implementations and compare to the baseline performance reported in this WCRI abstract. Future work will 1) rely on language models for both abbreviation extraction and classification, using 10-fold cross validation, and 2) focus on using domain-specific datasets.

Funding

The NanoBubbles project has received Synergy grant from the European Research Council (ERC, EU's H2020 program, agreement no. 951393).

P.28

Retractions due to Paper Mills: analyzing data from the Retraction Watch Database

Dr Edilson Damasio[1], ***Gabriel Gonçalves da Costa***[2]
[1]*State University of Maringá, Maringá, Brazil,* [2]*Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

Objective
Paper mills are increasing worldwide as a form of misconduct, generating concern within the scientific community. This unethical practice has extended to traditional publishers, who have begun identifying it. Retraction Watch Database was used to analyze retractions due to paper mills, focusing on trends over the years, countries of authors, publishers mostly involved in retractions because of paper mills, and the most frequent other retraction reasons related to them.

Methods
As of September 2025, all dataset extracted from the Retraction Watch Database using the Crossref API in a csv file with 59203 registers were analyzed. Among these retractions, 8258 had Paper mills attributed. Statistical analyses were performed using Excel and R software.

Results
The top years for paper mills cases were 2022 (n = 4039), 2021 (1564), 2020 (809), 2019 (655), 2018 (438) and 2017 (298). The countries with most retractions associated with paper mills were ´China´ (7392: 24% of total retractions), India (473: 11%), Saudi Arabia (317: 22%) and Ethiopia (286: 67%). The top publishers with most retractions associated with paper mills were Hindawi (5254), IOP Publishing (506), Elsevier (314) and Wiley (311). The primary reasons were specific ´Investigation by third party´ (7113), ´Investigation by journal/publisher´ (6841), ´Unreliable results´ (6033), ´Concerns/issues about data´ (4934), Referencing/Attributions´ (4241), ´Results´ (4132), ´with peer review´ (4046), ´Randomly generated content´ (4034) and ´Fake peer review´ (1969).

Conclusion
The countries with paper mills are China, India, Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia. The year with the highest 2022 resulted from exponential growth since 2017. In 2023, the number fell. The publisher that contributes the most to this growth in the time series is Hindawi, that crushed the numbers of other traditional publishers. The main reasons related to paper mills were ´Investigation by third party´, ´Investigation by journal/publisher´, ´Unreliable results´, Concerns/issues about data, referencing/attributions, and results. lowed by randomly generated content and ´Fake Peer Review´.

P.30

Open Science from Grant Proposal Plans to Published Practices: Observational Study

Ms. Ayu Putu Madri Dewi[1], *Dr. Inge Stegeman*[2,3], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[1]
[1]*Amsterdam UMC, Epidemiology and Data Science Department, Amsterdam, The Netherlands,* [2]*Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head & Neck Surgery University Medical Center, Utrecht, The Netherlands,* [3]*Brain Center, University Medical Center, Utrecht, The Netherlands*

Objective
To examine whether open science practices planned in grant proposals are subsequently implemented in the resulting publications.

Method
This observational cohort study is preregistered on the Open Science Framework (OSF) (https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/EMNDF). The study population will include ≥100 grant proposals with associated publications that used quantitative analyses, covering all research fields and years, and published online in English. We will use an existing dataset from our previous study (study registration: https://osf.io/ns4v9), which assessed the ability of referees during grant proposal reviews to predict the reproducibility of the resulting research using an open science checklist. Open science scores from the grant proposals are already available in this dataset.

For each associated publication, we will extract information on open science practices using the same checklist to ensure comparability. We will then compare and report the differences in the number and types of open science practices planned at the proposal stage with those actually reported in publications. The proportion of each open science practice will be reported and visualised in bar graphs.

Results
Out of 101 grant proposals, 10 indicated plans for protocol availability, 5 for study registration, 22 for open materials, 24 for open data, 23 for open code, 20 for code availability, 35 for software or tools, 35 for citing materials, 22 for citing data, 14 for citing code, 5 for transparent reporting, 26 for open access, 6 for preprints, and 1 for a registered report.

Scoring of funded publications will be completed and analysed before May 2026. Full results will be available at the time of the conference.

Conclusion
By identifying gaps between planned and implemented practices, the findings will inform funders, institutions, and researchers on how to strengthen mechanisms that promote transparency throughout the research lifecycle.

P.32

Detection of Malicious Forgery and Identification of Legitimate Editing in Academic Images

Mr. Junpeng Ding[1], ***Ms. Mengyuan Ji***[1], ***Mr. Haolin Tian***[1], *Mr. Feng Ling*[2], *Mr. Hongliang Hu*[2], *Mr. Xiaodong Qiao*[2], *Prof. Haihong E*[1]
[1]*Beijing University of Post and Telecommunication, Beijing, China,* [2]*Beijing Wanfang Data Co., Ltd., Beijing, China*

Objective
Recent years have witnessed rapid iterations of AIGC models and algorithms, enabling malicious actors to exploit AI editing techniques for fabricating academic images that evade manual scrutiny by reviewers and editors. The proliferation of fraudulent images poses a serious threat to research integrity. Current automated image forgery detection technologies face these challenges:

1) Traditional tampering detection models based on image segmentation can identify edge artifacts in spliced regions and detect manipulation traces. In practice, however, they generate numerous false positives due to their inability to distinguish legitimate editing behaviors, rendering them impractical.

2) State-of-the-art MLLM-based detection works well on semantically rich conventional images but loses accuracy on semantically sparse, feature-variable academic images (e.g., staining images).

Method & Results
To address the aforementioned technical challenges, we first curated authentic academic images across 39 fine-grained subcategories and selected 18 state-of-the-art commercial image generation models spanning diffusion-based (e.g., Stable Diffusion-3, DALL·E 3), autoregressive (CogView), and hybrid architectures (Wanx2.1-t2i-turbo) from 10 leading providers, including OpenAI, Tencent, and SenseTime. Using these models, we generated four categories of forged images based on authentic samples: text-constrained generation via reconstructed descriptions, globally reconstructed forgeries maintaining semantic consistency, generative inpainting for localized regions, and pixel-level targeted region manipulation. These four forgery types systematically simulate the majority of academic misconduct behaviors, ranging from wholesale fabrication to localized tampering.

Next, we trained a detection model with HRNet as backbone, using dual-channel input: RGB (visual artifacts) and DCT frequency domain (compression artifacts). It achieved 87.39% IoU in forged region identification.

Finally, we propose an MLLM-driven academic image forgery detection framework, which leverages the powerful visual perception and comprehension capabilities of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs). Through LoRA fine-tuning, the MLLMs perform post-processing on the detection model's outputs to accurately determine if edits are legitimate or malicious. The complete detection service maintains a false identification rate below 1.5%.

Conclusion
Based on the above methods, we provide academic image forgery detection services for scientific research papers on Wanfang, a large-scale intellectual property service platform in China, and have carried out preliminary commercial operations.

P.34

Establishing an Advisory Body for Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)

Dr. Mette Eriksen[1,2], ***Dr. Thea Marie Drachen***[1], *Mrs. Anne Thorst Melbye*[1]
[1]*University Library of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark,* [2]*CEBMO & Cochrane Denmark, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark*

Introduction
The Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity recommends access to impartial and professional guidance on research ethics. For more than a decade The University Library of Southern Denmark has provided teaching on RCR for PhD students. All the RCR instructors have received inquiries on research integrity, which could have been referred to an advisory body.

A broad group of management representatives at the university has been involved in the process of suggesting a structure for an advisory body at the University of Southern Denmark. The majority of those consulted expressed strong support for it. The issues brought up considered whether established support functions could manage the task and whether the advisory body should be in line with the management structure.

Already established support functions
- The Practice Committee is focused on dealing with potential breaches of good scientific practice; less suited for anonymous advice on grey-area behavior.
- Whistleblower Scheme is targeted at serious legal violations and other severe matters; not designed for advisory purposes.
- The Union Representatives do not provide guidance on research practice.
- Managers are not anonymous and may be involved in the issue.

Connection of advisory body to Management Structure
The advisory body must be disconnected from the management structure to ensure anonymity without which staff would likely feel discouraged to seek help / come forward.

Individuals seeking advice can choose a mediated conversation with a management representative or peer.

Proposed Structure for the Advisory Function
Local researchers with domain-specific expertise and a central unit consisting of individuals with competencies and knowledge in RCR.

Centrally and locally anchored advisors should form an equal and collaborative network. This suggested structure for an advisory function provides a basis for case-based sparring.

Essential qualifications
All the advisors should have insight into RCR, an interest in the advisory role, and the domain specific researchers should be established and experienced researchers. Appointed advisors should be offered training in crisis management and access to psychological support.

Evaluation of the advisory function
The structure, collaboration, and use of the advisory function should be evaluated for example, after two years.

P.36

Reviewer3.ai: An AI-Powered Platform for Human/AI Collaborative Conversational Peer-Review to Enhance Peer Review Quality and Reporting Standards Compliance

Prof. Gunther Eysenbach[1]
[1]*Laboratory for AI and Innovation in Scholarly Communication (LAIISC), School for Health Information Science, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada*

The reproducibility crisis in biomedical research has highlighted critical deficiencies in peer review processes, particularly regarding adherence to reporting guidelines such as CONSORT, STROBE, and PRISMA. Traditional peer review often fails to systematically verify compliance with these standards, contributing to incomplete reporting and reduced research integrity. Reviewer3.ai addresses this challenge through an intelligent, guideline-aware peer review platform that combines artificial intelligence with evidence-based reporting standards.
Reviewer3.ai leverages LLM AI to generate comprehensive peer reviews that explicitly evaluate and certify manuscript compliance with relevant EQUATOR Network reporting guidelines. The platform features a sophisticated guideline management system that has catalogued 664 reporting standards, with automated literature extraction capabilities that retrieve authentic checklist items from PubMed and PMC full-text sources.
The platform implements a four-tier user role system (End User, Journal Admin, Publisher Admin, Master Admin) supporting diverse stakeholder needs. Master administrators can configure AI models, manage versioned review prompts, and validate reference authenticity. Journal administrators can customize guideline requirements for their specific publication needs and verify compliance before submission.
Reviewer3.ai goes beyond simply automating parts of traditional peer review. It introduces what we call "Conversational AI-mediated Peer Review"—a fundamentally different approach that creates a triangular dialogue between AI systems, human experts, and authors. This isn't just a better peer review process; it's a reconceptualization of how scientific discourse occurs. The system employs ORCID OAuth and OpenSci.ID authentication to ensure reviewer identity verification and to maintain audit trails.
Reviewer3.ai can be used by authors as presubmission manuscript certification tool (certifying adherence to a relevant reporting checklist). For editors it can be used as a triage tool, to rate the quality of human reviewers and to provide additional AI insights, also enabling hybrid AI-human collaborative review workflows. Reviewers can use the system to check and improve their reviews.
By systematically integrating reporting guidelines into peer review, Reviewer3.ai aims to improve manuscript quality, enhance reproducibility, and strengthen research integrity across biomedical publishing. This platform represents a significant step toward automated quality assurance in scholarly communication.

P.38

Mapping the WCRI Community's Consensus on the Athens Statement

Dr. Daniele Fanelli[1]
[1]*Science of Science ltd., London, United Kingdom*

Objective
The Athens Statement was developed after the 2024 World Conference on Research Integrity, to emphasize the relevance of research integrity principles for processes and stakeholders involved in innovation and policymaking. Like statements produced at previous conferences, it aims to be ratified by the research integrity community of experts. This statement elicited feedback at multiple stages and, for the first time, it invited the entire WCRI community to confer, using an innovative methodology implemented by the platform comCensus.org. This talk will show where the community mostly agrees or disagrees with the Athens Statement, and how the feedback was incorporated.

Methods
All members within the mailing list of the WCRI were invited to contribute their feedback to the Athens Statement on comCensus.org. The response process involved the following steps: 1) Participants expressed their level of agreement and articulated their specific feedback; 2) An Artificial Intelligence tool translated their position into a set of statements, which the participant could approve or correct; 3) Participants then reacted to others' posts before seeing any results; 4) Participants could subsequently engage and discuss with each other and update their position until the discussion window closed.

Results
This talk will highlight topics of particularly high and low consensus emerged in the discussion among different participant demographics. The entire discussion underlying these results will be publicly available, allowing conference attendees to explore directly what the WCRI community thinks, and allowing them to transparently verify how the final version of the Athens Statement incorporated the respondents' feedback and sentiments.
Data are not available at the time of writing but are planned to be collected as part of the elaboration of the Athens Statement, which are presented at this same conference in a separate talk. The method is still experimental and this talk will overview limitations and challenges encountered.

Conclusions
Responsible Research and Innovation may be supported by large-scale, anonymous, transparent, public discussions facilitated by advanced technology. These results might help identify research integrity topics in which consensus is low and more discussions and research is needed.

P.40

Ethical Accountability in Research: Gaps Between 3Rs Policy and Practice in IACUCs and Publishers

Mr. Stephen Farghali[1], *Janine McCarthy*
[1]*Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, Washington, USA*

The trustworthiness of journal editors, reviewers, and publishers is fundamental to the assessment and application of research findings. However, as pay-to-publish models proliferate, financial incentives may compromise ethical review of manuscripts. Here, we assess a human nutrition journal that requires compliance with the 3Rs principle of 'replacement' and the ARRIVE guidelines by analyzing the journal's enforcement of these policies.

Original research articles published between January 2022 and December 2024 were cataloged and analyzed. Among 9,288 papers across 60 issues, 1,722 (19%) involved animal experiments. A subset was assessed for model choice and availability of human-relevant alternatives, and 945 were reviewed for ARRIVE compliance. Correspondence with editors was used to determine how responsibility for enforcing 3Rs and ARRIVE compliance is managed.

The majority of animal publications reviewed violated the 3Rs. A total of 84 (9%) reported adherence to ARRIVE. In our correspondence with editors, responsibility for 3Rs compliance was universally delegated to institutional committees. In one case, an article identified as noncompliant was slated for retraction, yet no action occurred more than a year after the journal's decision—illustrating weak accountability mechanisms and the absence of transparent follow-through in ethical oversight.

These results support the contention that alternatives to animal use are routinely ignored, even where human-specific, nonanimal methods are feasible. This raises the concern that journals may not be conducting independent ethical and scientific assessments regarding animal use, despite requirements in their adopted policies. Additionally, it places the burden of 3Rs enforcement in publishing on institutional committees.

While these findings demonstrate a need for improved oversight mechanisms during institutional review, we argue that it is inappropriate and impractical for journals to delegate enforcement of their policies to the affiliated institutions in manuscripts. Such practice risks undermining public trust in both the institutional and journal review processes, by allowing vague appeals to IACUC approval to serve as a substitute for accountability in the peer review process.

IACUCs can improve their oversight but must also define their roles in enforcing the 3Rs where oversight is inappropriately delegated to the institution. Such clarifications may help close the ethical loop between research approval and publication.

P.42

A Cautionary Tale Relating to a Research Integrity Complaint Process Involving Artificial Intelligence and Duplicate Publication

Dr. Misty Fish[1]
[1]*Curtin University, Bentley, Australia*

The issue of Artificial-Intelligence (AI), more particularly, AI generated publications, should be of concern researchers, institutions and those working in field of research integrity. To support researchers, it is important for institutions to consider where AI might be a risk, particularly if it is making research fraudulent and fake. This presentation is a brief cautionary tale relating to an integrity assessment process involving AI and duplicate publications. While appropriately kept anonymous and confidential, the case study involves important discussion of the risks to institutions and how research integrity professionals may choose to action and deal with similar matters as AI evolves into the future.

In Australia, institutions and researchers are required to comply with the principles and responsibilities set out in the NHMRC's Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 (the Code). The Code has broad relevance across all research disciplines. While the Code is the main framework in which responsible research practices are governed, institutions are responsible for developing their own responsible conduct of research policy and procedure governance and ensuring its implementation is consistent with the Code and accompanying guidelines.

Although the NHMRC has released guidance documents in support of the Code, for example, the Authorship Guide, at this time, there is no guidance document released by the NHMRC, in relation to AI. Institutions instead must have their own robust AI policy and procedures to ensure they keep up to date with AI development, and guide their students, staff and researchers.

That said, while there may be AI policy and procedure in place about how AI can be used by institutions researchers, what happens when AI is generating fake research publications resulting in complaints to the institution about self-plagiarism or duplicate publications? Can institutions protect their researchers from complaints, and are institutions adequately protecting their researchers from AI generated publications? This case study will highlight this evolving issue, discuss the challenges experienced in this case, and raise awareness of issues that institutions need to address, particularly to assist staff working in research integrity and for those focussed on promoting the responsible conduct of research.

P.44

Aftermath of IIETA Acquiring 7 Journals: Surge in Article Outputs with a Drastic Shift in Authorship Geography

Dr. Ophélie Fraisier-Vannier[1], *Prof. Guillaume Cabanac*[1,2]
[1]*University of Toulouse, France,* [2]*Institut Universitaire de France, France*

Objective
In 2018, 7 established French-speaking journals were sold by the French publisher Lavoisier to the Canadian International Information and Engineering Technology Association (IIETA): ACSM, I2M, ISI, JESA, RCMA, RIA, TS. IIETA turned these 7 subscription-based journals into open-access journals with APCs. Poor communication around this sale and questionable publishing practices led at least 3 editorial boards to resign in bulk. We reviewed the changes these journals underwent pre-sale (2001-2018) versus post-sale (2019-2024).

Methods
For the 7 journals, we retrieved from Crossref the metadata and DOIs minted by Lavoisier and IIETA. We then scrapped IIETA website to (1) check the availability of the articles (2) retrieve the authors' affiliations, which were not available from Crossref. We computed the number of articles for each journal per year and per country.

Results
Three findings stood out. First: 37% of the 7650 DOIs registered with Crossref do not resolve to the expected article page, which is nowhere to be found on IIETA.org or the now-defunct Lavoisier website. The 2828 missing articles were mostly published pre-sale of the journals: 58 DOIs over 2878 (2.0%) resolved successfully for the articles published in 2001-2018. 4764 DOIs over 4772 (99.8%) resolved successfully for the articles published in 2019-2025. Second: The journals saw a 4-fold increase in number of articles after the sale: 169 articles published in average pre-sale versus 859 post-sale, per year. The journals' output was multiplied by a factor ranging from 1.4 for ACSM to 23.3 for TS. Third: Affiliations stated on articles published in 2001-2013 are overwhelmingly in France. In contrast, articles published after 2018 are mainly affiliated to India, China, Iraq, Algeria, and Indonesia (France ranking 10th only). We also noted that the articles published post-sale are mainly written in English, which is unexpected given the French titles of the journals.

Conclusion
These 3 observations stress the clear contrast in authorships and publication output which happened after the sale of the 7 former Lavoisier journals.

P.46

Using AI for Creative Processes in Academic Writing: A Study of Researcher Perceptions

Mrs. Tove Faber Frandsen[1], *Mrs. Emanuela Marchetti, Ms. Diana-Andreea Sandu, Mr. Rasmus Ploug*
[1]*University of Southern Denmark, Kolding, Denmark*

Objective
AI is transforming academic writing practices promising increased productivity, however careful use of AI-powered tools is recommended to ensure accuracy and originality (Khalifa & Albadawy, 2024). AI-powered tools can increase productivity but are also at risk of polluting the research literature (Elali & Rachid, 2023). This study explores the use of genAI in research processes focusing on creativity and thus moving beyond text generation. More specifically, our aim is to develop and evaluate ethical aspects of use cases of genAI for creative processes in academic writing.

Methods
Using available AI-powered tools we have developed a number of use cases of genAI for humanities researchers allowing them to explore working creatively in the writing process. We are working primarily with general tools such as Copilot but we are also allowing them the opportunity to work with more specialized tools such as Napkin.ai. Furthermore, the workshops allow researchers to share experiences and discuss possibilities as well as challenges. We also offer the researchers follow-up support, offering individual guidance for those looking to explore AI-powered tools further. The analyses of these workshops focus on the perception of the researchers but also ethical issues arising during their use of these tools. We are thus also analyzing the careful and ethical use of these tools even if not used for text generation.

Results
We are currently planning the workshops for the researchers. We are running three workshops during the fall 2025 and will be able to report the results of these at the conference.

Conclusion
We will be able to conclude on how researchers from the humanities evaluate the use of AI-powered tools for creative processes in academic writing and whether the data revealed causes for concern in terms of ensuring accuracy and originality of the text being produced during these sessions.

References
Elali, F. R., & Rachid, L. N. (2023). AI-generated research paper fabrication and plagiarism in the scientific community. Patterns, 4(3).
Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update, 5, 100145.

P.48

Aspirational Ethics and Well-being Science as Foundations for Research Integrity Education: Practices at Two Japanese Universities

Prof. Jun Fudano[1]
[1]*Waseda University, Shinjuku, Japan*

Conventional research integrity (RI) education in Japan has primarily adopted a compliance-based and preventive approach, emphasizing regulations and the avoidance of misconduct. While this approach is essential, it often fails to foster intrinsic motivation or a sense of professional purpose among researchers. To address this limitation, RI courses at Waseda University—a leading private research university in Tokyo—and Chuo University—a comprehensive institution with long-standing strengths in law and policy—have been redesigned based on Aspirational Ethics, drawing inspiration from well-being science and positive education.

Aspirational ethics reorients RI education from "what must not be done" to "what kind of researcher one ought to become." This approach emphasizes moral aspiration, personal growth, and the pursuit of excellence and flourishing in both research and life. It aligns closely with well-being science, which highlights the importance of meaning, engagement, relationships, and accomplishment as key components of human flourishing. Integrating these ideas into RI education situates integrity not merely as compliance with external rules but as an expression of personal and collective well-being.

The courses incorporate reflective writing, case studies, peer dialogues, and designing of research integrity promotion plan that encourage students to identify their values, envision their ideal research selves, and explore connections between responsible research, happiness, and social contribution. Students are guided to consider how research integrity contributes to their own well-being and to the flourishing of the wider research community.

This poster will present:

1. The conceptual model linking aspirational ethics, well-being, and research integrity;
2. Examples of teaching and learning activities grounded in positive education principles; and
3. Reflections on integrating well-being frameworks into RI curricula in Japan.

By framing RI education as a form of human development grounded in well-being and positive motivation, this approach offers a transformative alternative to compliance-based instruction—positioning integrity as a pathway toward personal meaning, professional excellence, and collective flourishing.

P.50

Sweden—Towards a Whole-of-Government Approach to Responsible Internationalisation (A Process in Motion)

Mr. Albin Gaunt[1], ***Ms Isabella Palomba Rydén***[2], ***Ms Erika Dabhilkar***[2], ***Ms Ann-Mari Fineman***[3], ***Mr. Stefan Törnqvist***[4], *Ms Anne Carnwall*[4]
[1]STINT, The Swedish Foundation for Internationalisation of Higher Education and Research, Stockholm, Sweden, [2]Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, [3]Vinnova, Stockholm, Sweden, [4]The Swedish Research Council, Stockholm, Sweden

This session offers a snapshot of an ongoing Swedish process towards a whole-of-government approach to responsible internationalization. We will describe and discuss the interface between government, funding bodies, security authorities, and universities, where academic freedom, problem framing, transparent communication, and shared needs analysis are central.
We begin by describing the Swedish academic landscape, where universities are public authorities with statutory protection for academic freedom. We then outline how the national work and organisation of responsible internationalisation has evolved: national consultations, the design of a sector-based support function, and how the integration of research security into existing frameworks for research integrity and ethical review may take shape in the future.
An important message is that actors hold different views on what kind of national support is needed and how it should be organised. Universities emphasise proportionality, the need for a cultural shift, space for professional judgement, and a fear of losing academic autonomy. Smaller institutions worry about capacity and administrative burden. Funders seek clarity, consistency, and alignment with international standards, while security authorities stress the importance of coordinated risk management and clear mandates.
The Swedish experience shows that research security cannot be addressed in isolation; it must be managed alongside research integrity, ethics, and governance. The development of national guidelines for responsible internationalization have highlighted the need to clarify responsibilities between individual researchers, institutional leadership, and national authorities. Another key point has been the importance of trust-based dialogue between sectors which has proven crucial for shared problem understanding and maintaining a learning-oriented approach.
In the final part of the session we will reflect on possible models for shared responsibility, and on how to shape a research culture that remains “as open as possible and as secure as necessary”. The aim is to contribute to a broader international discussion on how medium-sized research systems can build coherent and proportionate strategies for responsible internationalization and research security in a changing geopolitical context.

P.52

Continuous Work-in-Progress Auditing of Clinical and Experimental Research: 10 Years On

*Dr. Celso Rebello[2], Luiz Vicente Rizzo[2], **Dr Anna Carla Goldberg**[1]*
[1]Goldberg Consultancy, Sao Paulo, Brazil, [2]Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, Sao Paulo, Brazil

In the final months of 2015, a 3-person committee (2 M.D. and 1 Ph.D.) began to implement research integrity in a 758-bed non-profit hospital complex in São Paulo, Brazil. With a strong leaning towards cultural change and training of all personnel involved in research, aiming to promote integrity in scientific research and publishing, the newly installed Office of Research Integrity (ORI-einstein) focused on training and perfecting necessary guidelines, checklists, and misconduct flowcharts. The ORI-einstein also initiated regular audits (chosen by randomization) of recently published papers, unpublished research (last 5 years), and ongoing research where at least 50% of data were already collected. This was made possible by a centralized database of all ongoing and finalized studies carried out in the organization. Beginning was slow, and from the first 6 audits in 2017, to 58 in 2019 and 89 in 2020; 141 in 2021; 99 in 2022; 89 in 2023 and 80 in 2024, the committee grew in size and know-how. Audits continued throughout the COVID-19 pandemic and is still fully functional. Today, a committee of 7 (all volunteers, including medical and non-medical researchers) reviews all ongoing projects, especially those which are patient-driven intervention clinical studies. A total of 620 studies has been reviewed from 2015 to the end of August 2025. Of note, audits where graduate students are enrolled are done live, with students and/or P.I.s taking active part. Major findings included several instances of ethical failings (mainly incorrect completion of the free and informed consent form and submission of partial and final reports to the research ethics committee), two retractions before publication, and honorary authorship. Whistleblowing by third parties accusing researchers of harassment has occurred and was investigated, but in all cases was triggered by personal relationship issues. Staff and researchers have evolved to the acceptance of the auditing system and a true effort to work with excellence. The final thought about these almost 10 years of work is the success of an approach geared towards continuous education and open debate of all studies in progress.

P.54

Identification of Areas to Support Storage of Raw Data of Published Papers: A Survey of an Institute at Queen Mary University of London

Prof. Jonathan Grigg[1], *Mr Adam Wilkinson*[1]
[1]*Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom*

Background
Effective management of raw data is essential for ensuring transparency, reproducibility, and long-term accessibility in research. To identify areas to support storage of raw data of published papers , in 2025 we conducted an online survey of senior academics belonging to one Institute of Queen Mary University of London's Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. Questions asked were about their first publication in 2023.

Results
We received responses from 73 participants;
1) Where did you store raw data stored of your first published paper in 2023?
24% Own computer
38% University Server
11% Commercial repository
7% Publisher's website
18% Other
2) Are metadata with these data?
60% Yes
39% No
3) What additional support would you like to see for storing of raw data?
17% None
42% University wide repository with DOI with support
31% Institute level repository and support
9% Other

Conclusions
The high proportion of data stored only on personal devices, lack of stored metadata, and the need for Institutional support for storage of raw data, suggest that we need to develop a coordinated institutional strategy to support raw data stewardship, including repository development, metadata standards, and researcher training. Institutional support to address these needs will enhance research integrity and compliance with open science principles.

P.58

Beyond the Algorithm: Why Research Integrity Solutions Require Cross-Sector Partnerships

Mrs. Hannah Heckner Swain[1]
[1]*Silverchair, Raleigh, USA*

Technology alone can't solve research integrity challenges. Effective AI-powered detection and intervention tools require collaboration between publishers, technology providers, researchers, and integrity experts. This presentation examines how cross-sector partnerships strengthen solutions by combining editorial expertise, platform integration capabilities, and research community input. Drawing on real-world implementations, the presentation will demonstrate how collaborative approaches can expand the industry's ability to improve detection accuracy, reduce editor burden, and maintain researcher trust while addressing emerging threats from AI-generated content and paper mills.

P.60

A Hidden Thread of Trust: Librarian Collaboration for Research Integrity

Dr. Robert Hilliker[1], ***Mr. Denis Lacroix***[2]
[1]*Springer Nature, Philadelphia, USA,* [2]*University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada*

Universities around the world establish rules and guidelines to situate research within an integrity framework echoing the recommendations from the OECD's Integrity and security in the global research ecosystem policy paper around honesty, accountability, openness, and fairness in research and publishing practices. Countless funding agencies also call for research integrity to be at the forefront of the work that they support. Researchers are used to developing their own research ethic plans and submitting them for approval; however, research integrity goes beyond research ethics and encompasses many different aspects of the research life cycle.

Numerous offices on university campuses exist to support various aspects of research integrity, yet significant gaps in training and infrastructure remain. Researchers might not suspect librarians as having an impact on research integrity services, yet libraries have been developing their own teams and offices to help bridge perceived research integrity gaps. Librarians have positioned themselves as champions of research data management, copyright and intellectual property awareness, research impact and assessment, and open access publishing: all of which influence research integrity whether researchers realize it or not. More recently artificial intelligence has further complicated academia's relationship with research integrity and has called upon librarians' to instill renewed confidence and to create synergy thanks to the library's areas of influence.

This poster explores the opportunities and challenges for libraries and librarians in providing services and resources to support research integrity at their institutions. By revealing the "hidden thread" connecting librarianship and research integrity, we invite conference participants to reimagine the library as an active collaborator in sustaining credibility, transparency, and ethical resilience across the research ecosystem.

P.62

Open Access to Research Sites and Materials is a Necessary Prerequisite for Ensuring Research Integrity

Prof. Søren Holm[1]
[1]*The University of Manchester & University of Oslo, United Kingdom*

One of the main justifications for requiring open access to research protocols, data and publications is that open access is a necessary prerequisite for ensuring research integrity. Without such access it is impossible to investigate whether the research was conducted, analysed and reported as planned, and to check that the analysis is correct. Open access is also justified by the possibility of reuse and reanalysis of data to increase the efficiency of scientific research.

This poster will show that the same arguments justify the open access to research materials (e.g. reagents, cell lines, sample etc) and to research sites (e.g. for archaeological or environmental research), and that open access to material and sites is necessary for ensuring research integrity and promote the efficiency of research.

The second part of the poster will then analyse two arguments against open access to sites and materials: 1) providing open access has prohibitive costs, and 2) the site or specific material is a depletable resource and access therefore has to be controlled. It will be argued that both arguments for restricting open access are valid in some specific contexts, but that their scope is restricted and that open access to sites and materials should be the norm, and not the exception. It will specifically be argued that if access is to be restricted, such restrictions cannot be justified by the interests of the researchers currently controlling sites or materials.

P.66

Paying a Bill for Paper Mills: Understanding Scholarly Communication as Valuation Practices

Mr. Joonha Jeon[1]
[1]*Center for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS), Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands*

Paper mills are service providers that systematically circumvent scholarly standards by bundling fabricated data, plagiarism, authorship sales, fraudulent peer reviews, and citation manipulation into a streamlined operation. Recent investigation suggests that 2% to 46% of manuscript submissions across various journals are suspected to be the product of paper mills (COPE & STM, 2022). Despite growing attention and concerns among stakeholders in research integrity, there has been limited research to understand the structural conditions of how a marketplace for paper mills has emerged to flourish (Byrne et al., 2024).

Previous literature on misconduct and manipulation in academic research has revealed vast grey zones between predatory and legitimate practices. Hence, paper mills are better understood as ever-evolving entities of systematic exploitations within the multi-stakeholder ecosystem of scholarly communication, involving diverse actors with distinct motivations and responses. Given this complexity, this research conceptualizes scholarly communication as an assemblage where paper mills emerge as strategic adaptations to particular valuation configurations. Rather than merely problematizing paper mills as violation of research integrity but by treating them as a lens into contemporary research systems, we can examine the incentive structures, evaluation metrics, and systemic vulnerabilities that create conditions for their emergence.

This research addresses three interconnected questions: 1) What are the operational characteristics, scale, and impact of paper mills? 2) What structural conditions and mechanisms enable paper mills to flourish, and why do researchers utilize their services? 3) How do different academic valuation practices across regions and disciplines create distinct marketplaces where paper mills position themselves as intermediaries? We propose a conceptual framework building on the literature of valuation studies, sociology of science, and science and technology studies to analyze how stakeholders assign value in scientific publishing and how paper mills exploit these valuation devices and practices. Methodologically, we develop a mixed method approach examining both pre-publication data (preprint servers, journal metadata, peer review interactions) and post-publication data (citations, retractions, altmetrics). The output of the research contributes to the fundamental understanding of the operational dynamics and enabling mechanisms of paper mills and provides foundational insights for the research integrity community to develop effective interventions.

P.68

Results of the Horizon EU Project BEYOND BAD APPLES

Dr. Eero Kaila[1], *Dr. Vivian Mbanya*[2], *Ms. Keziah Dash*[2], *Ms. Pooja Aryal*[2]
[1]*Finnish National Board on Research Integrity Tenk, Helsinki, Finland,* [2]*University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway*

Results of the Horizon EU Project BEYOND BAD APPLES

Eero Kaila, (Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, corresponding), Vivian Nchanchou Mbanya, (University of Oslo, UiO), Keziah Chanyisa Khayadi Dash (UiO) & Pooja Aryal (UiO)
https://beyondbadapples.eu

Abstract

The Horizon EU Project BEYOND BAD APPLES, a multinational effort of fourteen universities, two research integrity offices (Ofis and TENK), and Trilateral Research Ltd., working in close collaboration with ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices, has been active during the period 2023–2025. For its conclusion, we now present its main results.

The project explored individual and institutional responsibilities in addressing research misconduct (RM) while promoting research ethics (RE) and research integrity (RI). This was achieved through mapping existing knowledge and extensive stakeholder engagement. The aim of the project was to highlight the role of systemic and structural pressures rather than framing them solely as individual failings. The consortium developed new theory and training methodology, as well as assessment of their effects.

This poster presents the key advancements that BEYOND delivered over its duration. The project has condensed its efforts into three concluding documents: The Guidelines, a compact guide steering policy toward a more holistic conceptualization of research integrity. The Best Practices Manual bringing measures within the reach of professionals, and the Roadmap 2030 detailing the next steps forward. Events and publications (see bibliography below) will be listed as well. The poster will be complemented with a handout containing a summary and information on how to access the project's key outputs. There will also be a QR code linking to the BEYOND project's repository on the Embassy of Good Science, where the training materials of the project will be stored for long-term access.

Select bibliography

Mezinska, et al. 2024: "Report on the results of the BEYOND public consultation", DOI:10.5281/zenodo.13906445.

Rodrigues & Pizzolato, 2023: "Insights on the Socio-economic impacts of RM", DOI:10.53116/pgaflr.7721.

Slesinger & Simm. 2025: "The Politicization of Research Ethics and Integrity and its Implications for Research Governance", DOI:10.1007/s10805-024-09563-2.

Tammeleht & Löfström. 2025: "Measuring ethics training effectiveness – introducing a toolbox", DOI:10.1007/s40889-025-00214-7.

P.70

Advancing Ethical Oversight in AI Research: Towards Benchmarking Tools for Research Ethics Committees

*Mrs. Konstantina Giouvanopoulou[1], Dr. Marjo Rauhala[2], **Dr Matthias Kaiser**[3,4], Dr Xenia Ziouvelou[1], Dr Vangelis Karkaletsis[1], Dr. Vasiliki Mollaki[1]*
[1]Institute of Informatics and Telecommunications, National Centre for Scientific Research Demokritos, Athens, Greece, [2]Technische Universität Wien (TUW), Vienna, Austria, [3]Norwegian Institute for Sustainability Research, Norway, [4]University of Bergen, Norway

Research Ethics Committees (RECs) act as an essential intermediary between the research community and society. They ensure that research is conducted in accordance with fundamental ethical principles, safeguarding participants' rights and maintaining public trust in science. Traditionally, RECs have been most experienced in the assessment of biomedical research, for which well-established ethical frameworks and evaluation tools exist. However, the contemporary research landscape is rapidly changing. The increasing research interest in emerging technologies, such as Artificial Intelligence, as well as transdisciplinary research approaches and new players in research, such as online service providers, has introduced new layers of ethical complexity. These developments demand that RECs expand their capacities to assess ethical risks that extend beyond traditional biomedical paradigms.
Current evidence indicates that RECs face significant challenges in this regard, including limited expertise in technology-related ethics, lack of interdisciplinarity in committee composition, and insufficient technical knowledge to fully grasp the implications of AI research. While biomedical research benefits from instruments, such as the World Health Organization's tool for benchmarking ethics oversight of health-related research involving human participants, there is a lack of dedicated tools that support RECs in evaluating their capacities and competencies to review AI-related projects. This gap limits both the effectiveness and consistency of ethics review processes and across RECs. Addressing this need, the CHANGER project is developing a comprehensive benchmarking tool to assist RECs in identifying their strengths and limitations in assessing AI research. Based on indicators such as the legal context, composition, structure and availability of resources in RECs, procedures followed, training of REC members, independence, and transparency, the tool aims to be used by RECs and research institutions to improve the ethical oversight in AI research. Benchmarking tools are expected to enhance the preparedness of RECs to engage with emerging technologies and to contribute to the responsible and trustworthy advancement of AI research.

Acknowledgement: All authors were supported by the EU project CHANGER under Horizon Europe agreement No 101131683.

P.72

The Role of AI in Peer Review: A Three-Stage Analysis of Global Policies, Guidelines and Practices

Dr Chien Chou[1], ***Mrs. Chunlin Kao***[1]
[1]*National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu, Taiwan*

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has increasingly become embedded in scholarly workflows. However, the integration of AI into the peer review process—a critical mechanism for ensuring the quality, integrity, and credibility of academic work—has raised important ethical, practical, and procedural concerns.
This study conducts a document analysis of the policies and guidelines issued by major international research funding agencies (e.g., the European Union's Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, the United States' NIH and NSF, Canada's Tri-Agency, Japan's JSPS, and South Korea's NRF), international academic societies (e.g., ACM, AMA, APA, ICMJE), major academic publishers (e.g., Elsevier, Sage, Springer Nature, Taylor & Francis, Wiley), and leading journals (e.g., The Lancet, Nature, Science). The aim is to understand their current positions and recommendations regarding the use of AI in peer review.
The findings propose a conceptual framework that divides the peer review process into three distinct stages. In the first stage—prior to external peer review—AI technologies are increasingly employed to support administrative and technical checks, including plagiarism detection, statistical error identification, formatting validation, and the selection of suitable reviewers. These functions are widely accepted and expected to become more automated over time. In the second stage—during the external evaluation of manuscripts—most organizations explicitly prohibit reviewers from using AI to generate or assist in writing review comments. This restriction is driven by concerns about data confidentiality, the potential for AI to perpetuate biases or generate inaccurate assessments, and the lack of transparency regarding how AI systems process sensitive manuscript content. In the third stage—after reviews are submitted—AI tools may assist editors by summarizing reviewer feedback or assessing whether authors have addressed reviewers' concerns in their revisions. Nonetheless, final editorial decisions are reserved for human judgment.
This study concludes by emphasizing the need for agencies and journals that have yet to address AI in their peer review policies to develop clear, enforceable guidelines. Additionally, it calls for reviewers to uphold high ethical standards and remain vigilant in maintaining the integrity of academic evaluation amidst rapidly evolving technological capabilities.

P.74

Results From a Scoping Review on Reproducibility Interventions and the Development of a Toolbox of Such Interventions

Dr. Panagiotis Kavouras[1,2], *Ms. Pooja Aryal*[1], *Ms. Ilse De Jong*[3], *Dr. Joeri Tijdink*[3], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[4], *Prof. Mads Sørensen*[5], *Dr. Daniele Fanelli*[6,7], *Mrs. Vana Stavridi*[8], *Dr. Dimitrios Koulos*[8], *Mr. Leonidas Ananiadis*[8], *Dr. Eleni Spyrakou*[8], *Prof. Rosemarie De La Cruz Bernabe*[1]

[1]*Centre for Medical Ethics, Institute of Health and Society, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway,* [2]*HEAL-Link Office, Library & Information Center, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece,* [3]*Department of Ethics, Law and Humanities, Amsterdam University Medical Centres, Amsterdam, The Netherlands,* [4]*Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam University Medical Centres, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands,* [5]*Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, The Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus, Denmark,* [6]*Science of Science ltd., , United Kingdom,* [7]*Department of Research Methods and Practice, School of Social Sciences, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom,* [8]*Department of Materials Science and Engineering, School of Chemical Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece*

TRUSTparency (https://trustparency-project.eu/), a project funded by the European Commission, has conducted a scoping review of reproducibility interventions (RI), which can potentially be implemented by research performing organisations, research funders, publishers, and learned societies. This scoping review is an update of the one that has been conducted by OSIRIS and TIER2 projects (Dudda L et al. 2025 Open science interventions to improve reproducibility and replicability of research: a scoping review. R. Soc. Open Sci. 12: 242057). TRUSTparency's scoping review has covered the timeframe from August 2023 (where the OSIRIS/TIER2 scoping review ended) until March 2025. This update was considered necessary, to keep abreast of the latest developments with regard RI. After title/abstract and full text screening, data extraction was conducted for 68 publications; some preliminary results follow. The disciplinary focus of the RIs retrieved was: 50% from Medical and Health Sciences, 13% from Engineering and Technology, 13% from Natural Sciences, and the rest from all remaining disciplines. Open Science (OS)-related practices were the prevalent types of RIs. Specifically, 35% was OS policies and guidelines, 31% was Open methodologies, 16% was OS tools, 13% was Open data and materials; only 5% of the RIs found were not related to OS practices, in agreement with the OSIRIS/TIER2 scoping review. At the time of writing the analysis of the extracted data was in full swing. During the WCRI2026 additional results will be presented, such as a more granular categorization of the RIs across disciplines and types of RIs, placement in the research cycle, relevant types of stakeholders as end users, and overarching limitations of the RIs. Finally, we are going to present an early view of a repository of Ris, which will combine the results of the scoping reviews of OSIRIS/TIER2 and TRUSTparency. We will present its basic structure and the set of descriptors that will be used to categorise the RIs. This repository will be part of the project's reproducibility promotion plans, which will be a sequence of concrete steps to transfer the practices that promote reproducibility to their everyday work and to monitor their effectiveness with mechanisms customised to their specific needs.

P.76

An Innovative Modular Approach to Foster Responsible Research Practices

Mrs. Silke Kniffert[1]
[1]*Berlin Institute of Health (BIH) at Charité, Berlin, Germany*

Contemporary research faces the dual challenge of protecting sensitive data, intellectual property, and proprietary methodologies while maintaining transparency, reproducibility, and collaboration as essential drivers of scientific progress. Responsible Research Practices (RRP) address this challenge by combining traditional methodological principles with elements of open science, research integrity, and ethics to promote rigor and accountability throughout the research process. Building competencies in RRP is therefore crucial for strengthening robust research, as it equips researchers with the skills and judgment needed to balance protection and openness in science. Without sufficient methodological expertise in areas such as secure handling of data, ethical compliance, and reproducible workflows, this balance can be easily disrupted, compromising both research integrity and credibility. Systematic training in RRP fosters both technical proficiency and normative understanding.

The Fundamentals of Responsible Research (FoRR) course, introduced in this contribution, exemplifies an integrative and flexible approach to research training. Offered in a modular blended-learning format, it combines instruction on research conception, study design, data management, and publication with interactive components that foster critical reflection on ethical and methodological challenges. Its modular structure can be readily adapted and allows it to be implemented across academic levels, disciplines, and institutions. Originally developed for doctoral students in medicine and dentistry (MD and DMD), the program is currently being adapted for PhD candidates and will next be extended to the BIH Clinician Scientist Program. Supported by a train-the-trainer initiative, FoRR now reaches up to 80 participants per semester, demonstrating its scalability and transferability across diverse research contexts.

This scalable and flexible model represents an innovative approach to embedding RRP within diverse academic pathways. In the future, its modular structure and broad thematic scope will allow participants to tailor their training to their academic level and research needs, thereby maintaining both relevance and impact. Ultimately, such a targeted approach will foster a culture where both the protection and the openness of research are pursued in concert rather than in conflict.

P.78

Exploring Ethical Elements in Reporting Guidelines: Results from a Research-on-Research Study

Dr. Carla Brigitte Susan Kohl[1], *Prof. Clovis Mariano Faggion Jr*[1]
[1]*Department of Periodontology and Operative Dentistry, University Hospital Münster, Germany, Münster, Germany*

Background
Reporting guidelines are key tools for enhancing the transparency and reproducibility of research. To support responsible reporting, such guidelines should also address ethical considerations. However, the extent to which these elements are integrated into reporting checklists remains unclear. This study aimed to evaluate how ethical elements are incorporated in these guidelines.

Methods
We identified reporting guidelines indexed on the “Enhancing the Quality and Transparency of HealthResearch (EQUATOR) Network” website. On 30 January 2025, a random sample of 128 reporting guidelines and extensions was drawn from a total of 657. For each, we retrieved the associated development publication and extracted data into a standardised table. The assessed ethical elements included COI disclosure, sponsorship, authorship criteria, data sharing guidance, and protocol development and study registration. Data extraction for the first 13 guidelines was conducted independently and in duplicate. After achieving 100% agreement, the remaining data were extracted by one author, following “A MeaSurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews” (AMSTAR)-2 recommendations.

Results
The dataset comprised 101 original guidelines and 27 extensions of existing guidelines. Half of the included guidelines were published from 2015 onward, with 32.0% published between 2020 and 2024. The median year of publication was 2016. Approximately 90 of the 128 assessed guidelines focused on clinical studies. Over 70% of the guidelines did not include items related to conflicts of interest (COI) or sponsorship. Only 8.6% addressed COI and sponsorship jointly in a single item, while fewer than 9% covered them as two separate items. Notably, only two guidelines (1.6%) provided instructions for using the ICMJE disclosure form to report potential conflicts of interest. Nearly 20% of the guidelines offered guidance on study registration. Fewer than 30% recommended the development of a research protocol, and only 18.8% provided guidance on protocol sharing. Additionally, fewer than 10% of the checklists included guidance on authorship criteria or data sharing.

Conclusion
Ethical considerations are insufficiently addressed in current reporting guidelines. The absence of standardised items on COIs, funding, authorship, and data sharing represents a missed opportunity to promote transparency and research integrity. Future updates to reporting guidelines should systematically incorporate these elements.

P.80

American Society for Microbiology Incorporates Imagetwin to Address Image Duplication and Preserve Scientific Accuracy

*Dr. Aashi Chaturvedi[1], Ms. Alicea Hibbard[1], Mr. Chad Nelson[1], Dr. Arturo Casadevall[2], **Dr. Amy Kullas**[1]*
[1]American Society for Microbiology, Washington, USA, [2]Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Baltimore, USA

Image duplication in scientific articles—accidental or intentional—undermines trust in research, authors, institutions, and publishers. Duplications not only cast doubt on researchers' scientific rigor, but they also raise concerns about potential misconduct, jeopardizing careers and even calling into question the effectiveness of the peer review process and editorial oversight. Ultimately, these issues erode confidence in the published study and, more broadly, the entire scientific community. However, when combined with expert in-house staff verification and artificial intelligence-based tools like Imagetwin, Proofig, etc., publishers can detect potential image duplications before publication and strengthen the integrity of the scientific record. In 2023, the American Society for Microbiology (ASM) Journals program integrated Imagetwin into its editorial workflow and conducted a 1-year pilot study. Here, we present key findings and highlight how ASM Journals refined its processes to incorporate image duplication screening earlier in the manuscript lifecycle. The pilot identified image duplications prior to publication in 3.9% of accepted, eligible manuscripts screened with Imagetwin. Most image concerns were unintentional and readily resolved. Of the 2,627 accepted manuscripts screened during the pilot, acceptance was revoked for six (0.23%) due to unresolved issues. It is now a key component of the routine ethics checks performed by ASM journals.

P.82

Assessment of the Impact of an International Research Integrity Course on Graduate Students at a Brazilian Research Institute

Ms. Cintia Lanzarini[1]
[1]*Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil,* [2]*National Cancer Institute, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

Research integrity is fundamental for the reliability of scientific knowledge, since questionable research practices and research misconduct can compromise the validity of data and research trustworthiness. Individual and external factors influence researcher behaviors. Beyond this, responsible conduct of research (RCR) also depends on essential competencies, which must be learned. RCR courses are worldwide recognized as essential for promoting responsible research practices. Brazil has been making progress in implementing research integrity education initiatives, but evidence on their effectiveness and impact in the country remains limited. This study aims to evaluate the impact of an international one-week course on research integrity, to be offered in January 2026 to graduate students at the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz), a leading Brazilian public research institution. This course is supported by the Vice-Presidency of Education, Communication, and Information at Fiocruz and by the Graduate Program in Translational Research in Drugs and Medicines. It will feature an international researcher with experience in teaching research integrity, open science, and reproducibility. The course will include up to 40 Fiocruz graduate students, with participation either in person or remotely. Course impact will be evaluated by assessing changes in participants' attitudes and behaviors regarding responsible research conduct, as well as their perceptions of their potential to influence colleagues in their research environment. Our study is exploratory and prospective, with questionnaires administered before, immediately after, and three months following the course. The questionnaires were adapted from a previously reported survey, translated into Portuguese, and will be reviewed by three experts before administration. We expect that our results will contribute to the evaluation of course methodologies our group has been adopting and provide insights on how it can be improved in future educational strategies at Fiocruz. Additionally, we anticipate that the findings from this survey may provide evidence to inform institutional decisions regarding the value of investing in RCR training. Beyond the local context, this study may enhance the broader understanding of the impact of RCR education in classroom settings on student knowledge and capacity-building in responsible research conduct. The study will proceed only after ethical approval by the institutional Research Ethics Committee.

P.84

Balancing Scale and Scrutiny: Hybrid AI-human Review for Scientific Abstracts in a Leading Cardiology Conference

*Ms. Rachel Ennis[1], **Mr. Samuel Leslie**, Shilpi Mehra[1], **Mr. Nikesh Gosalia***
[1]Cactus, Singapore 069046, United Kingdom

Objective
This study explores how AI-assisted validation combined with expert review can strengthen research integrity in large-scale conference abstract submissions. Based on leading cardiology annual conferences, we aim to present a scalable hybrid model that detects risks, improves efficiency, and provides actionable insights for editorial decision-making.

Methods
Approximately 30,000 abstracts submitted to cardiology scientific meetings organized by a leading nonprofit supporting cardiovascular science are undergoing hybrid screening. The AI tool flags anomalies in text consistency, reference accuracy, guideline adherence, and prolific author submissions. Expert reviewers then validate AI-flagged cases and assess submission patterns to identify potential risks and refine editorial workflows.

Results
Preliminary observations indicate that AI-assisted checks can identify issues not easily captured through traditional peer review. The most recurrent challenges include inconsistent disclosures, reference anomalies, and potential patterns of prolific or duplicate submissions by individual authors. Seasonal submission spikes seem linked to higher incidences of integrity concerns, highlighting the need for targeted review during peak periods. Importantly, the AI screening system effectively prioritizes abstracts for expert attention, allowing reviewers to focus on the most critical cases. This hybrid process demonstrates promise in both improving detection of potential risks and streamlining reviewer workload. By the time of the conference, we will present comprehensive findings from the ongoing analysis of over 30,000 abstracts, including detailed patterns of submission behavior, integrity gaps, and recommendations for editorial policy enhancements. These results will highlight the potential of integrating AI-driven tools into large-scale editorial processes.

Conclusion
AI-assisted validation when combined with expert review provides a scalable approach to safeguarding research integrity in large-scale abstract submissions for cardiology scientific meetings organized by a leading nonprofit supporting cardiovascular science. Early results highlight its potential to improve detection, reduce reviewer burden, and strengthen editorial confidence. Final findings will include policy recommendations and best practices in scientific publishing that can be adapted by more conferences.

P.86

The Future of Papermill Detection: Towards Collective AI Intelligence

Dr. Elena Vicario[1], Dr Anna Rabitti[1], Ms. Simone Ragavooloo[1], Mr Luca Bontempi[1], Mr Toby Dore[1], Mr Jamie Whitehead[1], ***Mx. Catriona Leslie***[1]
[1]*Frontiers Media Ltd, Lausanne, Switzerland*

The academic publishing ecosystem faces an ever-increasing threat from papermills. As reported by Retraction Watch, the number of papermill linked retractions and submissions has surged each year, going up by approximately 312.4% between 2020 and 2025. At Frontiers, we are constantly evolving our papermill detection methods and calibrating our rejections and have seen a steady increase in rejections for papermill suspicion over the past five years, underscoring the size of the problem and the dynamic, ever-evolving tactics employed by these bad actors.

In response to this growing threat, AI-powered detection tools have emerged as the first line of defence. Like papermills, these AI tools iterate their technologies constantly, adapting to new papermill signals as they surface. Despite an increased in collaboration across the publishing industry to combat papermills, there does not seem to be a clear consensus on what papermill features are, or they evolve too quickly for tools to adapt with. Our comparative study, conducted in partnership with Cactus and Clearskies, reveals critical limitations. We analysed the detection mechanisms, coverage, and outputs of the three major vendors. The results indicate remarkably low overlap between suspected papermill articles flagged across different tools. In a sample of 16619 articles submitted to Frontiers between June and September 2025, 5342 were flagged by at least one tool, with only 3% of these being flagged by all three tools. This suggests that each system captures distinct subsets of papermill output, but they do not necessarily agree on the outcome.

Our findings indicate that no single AI solution presently offers a comprehensive defence. Detection models exhibit black box behaviour and discipline biases persist, underscoring the risk of strategies that tackle individual aspects of papermill manuscripts. To address this, we propose that knowledge sharing across all publishers is the only way to align on creating a single definition of papermill and an accurate way of identifying them. By pooling intelligence we can reduce duplicated effort and improve detection accuracy across multiple publishers.

Embracing interconnected, AI-driven automation can empower smaller, more effective RI teams, furthering trust in science even as the threat from papermills grows more complex.

P.88

Power Model for Grant Applications

*Prof Qingyuan Chai[3], Prof Kevin Lang[2], **Prof. Liang Zhong**[1]*
[1]The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, [2]Boston University, Boston, US, [3]NYU Shanghai, China

Objective
This paper examines why statistical power in grant applications is systematically miscalculated and proposes a corrected framework. We distinguish between estimates from previous studies and those expected in grant-funded replications, showing how conventional thresholds (e.g., t = 2.8) overstate true power. We provide theoretical derivations and empirical evidence from development economics.

Methods
We build a formal model linking previous study estimates (ˆβ, ˆse, ˆt) to grant-funded replications (˜β, ˜se, ˜t), accounting for latent true parameters. Using data from top development economics journals (2015–2024), we calculate actual versus perceived power, simulate alternative sample sizes, and evaluate grant agency decision rules under varying effect-size thresholds.

Results
analysis demonstrates that the conventional practice of setting tp = 2.8 to achieve 80% power substantially overstates the probability of detecting true effects. Across 25 leading journals and recent JDE issues, we find that false positive rates remain high, while actual replication power is often below 50% even when applicants claim 80%. Simulations show that doubling sample size from N to 2N increases true power, but not to the levels implied by standard calculations. Based on our framework, we further propose the “grant agency problem”: when agencies fund only studies exceeding a minimum effect size c, the probability that the true effect exceeds c, and we found this number is constant across different choices of c when the density of the t-statistic follows the Laplace distribution. Finally, we introduce the concept of empirical power in parallel universes: the probability of replicating the same test under identical conditions. This measure reveals that published development RCTs exhibit lower reproducibility than implied by proposal-stage calculations, highlighting a structural gap between perceived and actual evidence strength.

Conclusion
Grant application power calculations are biased upward, leading to inflated expectations of study success. Correcting these miscalculations requires revised thresholds and empirical power assessments. While our framework improves accuracy, limitations include reliance on published studies and assumptions about latent distributions. Our findings underscore the need for more realistic grant evaluation standards.

P.90

College Research Ethics Boards of Quebec, Canada (REBs): Mandate, Governance and Resources

Dr. Emmanuelle Marceau

Objective
The development of research ethics in the Quebec college environment raises specific concerns for institutions and research ethics board (REB), given the particularities of this environment, and the respect of the principles of research ethics, as set out in the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 (TCPS 2). This study focuses on three priority issues for the college research ethics community: 1) the question of resources for ethics review by college network REBs; 2) the review of multi-jurisdictional research projects; and 3) the review of student course-based research activities. The aim of this study was to characterize these issues by drawing on the real-life experience of the stakeholders in the ethics review of research projects.

Methods
order to sound out this community on its concrete realities with regard to these issues, we carried out a mixed real time Delphi study using the Surveylet platform, during which we engaged 31 panelists in dialogue over a total period of five weeks.

Results
Panelists reported a lack of human and financial resources, and the variability of some REB members' training and available continuing education. They also mentioned the fact that ethics review of multicenter projects raises tensions between administrative efficiency and local responsibility, with divergences over trust between REBs. With regard to student projects with pedagogical aims, their evaluation is deemed necessary, but responsibilities between teachers and REBs are unclear, and resources for implementation are insufficient. Proposed solutions include asynchronous training, harmonized tools and better collaboration between players. Tools were subsequently developed by the research team to meet the needs identified by the panelists. While this research produced some very interesting and rich results, it should be noted that the unfamiliar Delphi method limited the engagement of some panelists. Technical constraints on the platform restricted interaction, and some nuances in responses could not be captured.

Conclusion
The study sheds light on the ethical challenges specific to the college environment and suggests concrete ways of strengthening the practices, collaboration and resources of research ethics committees.

P.92

Reuse and Republication of Data from Randomized Controlled Trials Retracted Between 2018 and 2022: A Retrospective Cohort Study

*Dr. Ioana Cristea[1], **Ms. Minoo Matbouriahi**[1], Dr. Florian Naudet[2,3], John Ioannidis[4]*
[1]University Of Padova, Padova, Italy, [2]University of Rennes, Rennes, France, [3]Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, France, [4]University of Stanford, Stanford, USA

Objective
Retracted articles are theoretically removed from the evidence ecosystem, but the data underlying them may persist in existent or subsequent publications. Using clinical trial registration (CTR) or institutional review board (IRB) approval strings from retracted articles, we aim to identify publications with data overlapping, totally or partly, with retracted randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Methods
Retrospective cohort study of RCTs retracted over a 5-year period (2018-2022), identified from the Retraction Watch database using all labels referring to clinical studies, except pre-prints. RCTs needed to be published in 2006 or later to post-date prospective registration mandates, with retractions for reasons clearly not imputable to authors and not accompanied by republication. For each retracted RCT, we extracted CTR or IRB approval strings in full-texts and searched each string on Digital Science' Dimensions database to identify overlapping publications.

Results
Of 516 retracted clinical study entries, 182 were RCTs published in 2006 or later. Of these, 2 were unavailable and 73 listed no registration or approval strings (40%, 95 confidence interval/CI 33% to 48%). Of the remaining 107 RCTs with a CTR or IRB string, we have examined 70 and will complete the remaining 37 for the WCRI. Overall, of 70 retracted trial reports providing a searchable string, we identified 12 instances of publications using data from the index retracted trial (17%, 95% CI 9% to 28%), 6 (9%, 95% CI 3% to 18%) of which post-dated retraction. Additionally, we found 6 cases (9%, 95% CI 3% to 18%) where a report used the same CTR or IRB approval number as the index retracted trial, though it concerned a different population or intervention. Only one case disclosed the retraction of the index trial in the overlapping publication.

Conclusions
We describe a systematic examination of the use and republication of data from retracted randomized trials. Overall, less than 1 in 10 of trials published after registration mandates, retracted for reasons imputable to authors, and that listed a registration or approval strings, were later republished. As 40% of retracted trials included no registration or approval numbers, our findings may underestimate the extent of republication.

P.94

Emerging Trends and Guidelines on Research Integrity and Research Misconduct

Dr. Vivian Mbanya[1], *Associate Professor Alina Coman*[2], *Mrs Keziah Khayadi Dash*[1], *Professor Tonje Lossius Husum*[2], *Ms Jana Dilger*[3], *Prof. Rosemarie De La Cruz Bernabe*[1]
[1]*University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway,* [2]*Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet), Oslo, Norway,* [3]*Trilateral Research Ltd, London, UK*

Objective
This study presents the findings of a scoping review of research ethics and research integrity guidelines, frameworks, and SOPs. As part of the Horizon Europe project “Beyond Bad Apples” (BEYOND) https://beyondbadapples.eu/, this study aims to identify covered areas, gaps, and areas with insufficient coverage in existing guidelines to inform the development of a best practices manual and roadmap for strengthening research integrity measures.

Methods
A scoping review methodology was performed from April-May 2023, to identify gaps in 68 existing research integrity and ethics guidelines from Europe and other global sources. It involved a grey literature search to identify gaps and uncovered areas in official documents, as these are not typically in academic databases. The analysis used an inductive thematic approach performed by a collaborative team of researchers to identify recurring topics in the documents. PRISMA-ScR checklist was used to report the process and study results.

Results
The review found that most guidelines emphasize core principles such as honesty, accountability, and respect, and provide clear guidance on authorship, publication, and the definition of research misconduct, including falsification, fabrication, and plagiarism. Most documents also detail the procedures for investigating allegations and outlining sanctions. However, the analysis identified significant gaps and underexplored areas. These include a lack of guidance on adapting to digital and technological developments, such as artificial intelligence and citizen science. Very few documents provide specific measures for ensuring diversity, inclusion, and equity within research. Furthermore, while most guidelines outline investigative procedures for RM, they often lack sufficient detail on the prevention of misconduct, the protection of whistleblowers, or measures to support the accused during an investigation.

Conclusion
While a strong foundation of core principles and investigative procedures exists, there is a clear need for updated guidelines that address emerging technological challenges and foster a more inclusive, supportive, and psychologically safe research culture. The findings from this review will directly inform the creation of a best practices manual to address these identified gaps.

P.96

Replicating Reviews: Insights from the CAMARADES Reproducibility Challenge on Preclinical Systematic Reviews

Dr. Sarah McCann[1], *Bruno Arbo*[5], *Maria Arroyo Araujo*[1], *Alexandra Bannach-Brown*[1], *Dr. Maria Economou*[1], *Matheus Gallas-Lopes*[5], *Daria Grameni*[3], *Kaitlyn Hair*[4], *Ana Paula Herrmann*[5], *Matthew Jeffers*[2], *Manoj Lalu*[2], *Aileen MacLellan*[2], *Malcolm Macleod*[3], *Angelo Piato*[5], *Torsten Rackoll*[1], *Fiona Ramage*[3], *Sean Smith*[3], *Wimonchat Tangamornsuksan*[2], *Francesca Tinsdeall*[3], *Daniela Varisco Müller*[5], *Sofija Vojvodic*[1], *Kimberley Wever*[6], *Emma Wilson*[3]

[1]*Berlin Institute of Health at Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany,* [2]*Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada,* [3]*University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom,* [4]*University College London, London, United Kingdom,* [5]*Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil,* [6]*Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

Objective

Systematic review (SR) and meta-analysis are rigorous methods increasingly used to improve the robustness and translation of preclinical (animal and in vitro) research. However, the replicability and reproducibility of preclinical SRs remain largely untested. The CAMARADES Reproducibility Challenge was organised to empirically assess the reproducibility of published preclinical SRs and identify factors that shape replication success.

Method

Supported by the iRISE (improving Reproducibility In SciencE) consortium, CAMARADES (Collaborative Approach to Meta-Analysis and Review of Animal Data from Experimental Studies) ran the challenge as part of the 5th International Systematic Reviews of Studies in Animals and in Vitro (SR-SAVI) Conference (Zürich, Switzerland, 2024). Teams of researchers were invited to replicate (parts of) published preclinical SRs and present their findings on i) the extent to which they could replicate the study components, and ii) the extent to which they could reproduce the results of the original SR. Quantitative replication outcomes and qualitative reflections from teams were synthesised to identify barriers and facilitators of reproducibility.

Results

Five teams participated, attempting to replicate four published SRs that evaluated treatment efficacy in animal models of disease. Three teams performed complete, preregistered SR replications, while two teams carried out partial replications of specific review stages. All teams examining treatment efficacy reproduced the main conclusions of the original SRs, although with differences in the magnitude and precision of estimated effects. Discrepancies frequently arose in the individual steps of the reviews, for example the number of studies included, or risk of bias assessments. These were largely attributable to incomplete or ambiguous reporting of search strategies, inclusion criteria, and analytical methods in the original reviews, as well as limited access to underlying data and analysis scripts.

Conclusion

This initiative represents the first coordinated effort to test the reproducibility of preclinical SRs. The Reproducibility Challenge format provided an engaging forum for community learning and methodological reflection. Despite challenges in replicating some review components, overall conclusions were consistent across teams, providing confidence in the robustness of preclinical SR findings. The lessons learned will inform the refinement of reporting standards and strengthen the transparency and reproducibility of future preclinical evidence syntheses.

P.98

Supporting Peer Review Expertise Development: The Role of Integrated Co-Review

Dr. Gráinne McNamara[1], *Dr. Teresa Telles Gonçalves Mathews*[1]
[1]*Karger Publishers, Basel, Switzerland*

Objective
Publication integrity is strongly reliant on a robust peer review process. Journals and publishers have a responsibility to help editors identify suitable experts as peer reviewers and to support the development of peer review expertise in early career researchers (ECRs) and their recognition. To this end, in July 2025, Karger Publishers introduced a co-review process integrated into the peer review platform in over 90 journals. This study aims to understand the impact of the availability of the integrated collaborative co-review on the professional development of ECRs and the peer review process.

Methods
An online survey will be sent to all co-reviewers who have completed a review in the first 6 months of the initiative. The anonymous survey will ask respondents about their motivation to co-review and their experience of the process. We will use Karger Publishers' database of peer review information for 90 journals in the health sciences to examine the impact of co-review on peer review metrics, including editorial decision and peer review duration.

Results
We will report summary statistics on the uptake of co-review across subdisciplines in the health sciences. We will report results from the conducted survey on why individuals choose to participate in co-review, as a mentor and mentee, and their experiences of the process. We will also report on the impact on the peer review process of co-review, using submissions and reviews within the same journal without co-review as a comparison group.

Conclusion
This study will examine the motivation to act as a mentor in the peer review process and the self-reported benefits to ECRs of co-review. A limitation of the study is that it will represent only the initial 6 months of availability of the integrated co-review process and survey completion will be optional. Overall, the study will provide insights into the benefits to the scholarly publishing ecosystem of a formal co-review process in journals.

P.100

Co-designing a National RURM Resource to Support Research Integrity

Dr. Colleen Thomas, ***Prof. Grace Mulcahy***, *Dr Emma Dorris, Mr Patrick Phillips*
[1]*University College Dublin, Belfield, Ireland*

Objective
Pressures to publish, valuing only narrow ranges of outputs, and questionable authorship practices all undermine research integrity, fomenting poor culture in the research environment (Chakraborty, 2025). Research assessment mechanisms strongly influence behaviours and attitudes of researchers consequently linking it to research culture (Science Europe, 2023). Poor use of metrics can enable a culture which distorts scholarship, potentially resulting in citation biases (Devries et al, 2018), disproportionately affecting women and minority researchers (Martin et al, 2019), and producing general inequities between research disciplines (Pells, 2018; Chawla, 2016; Inge, 2018). Mainstreaming responsible use of research metrics (RURM) practices underpins the development of an evaluation system that appropriately recognises the broad range of outputs beyond publications and transparency integral to an open research environment supporting research integrity.
Quality training is key to advancing knowledge of RURM; in Ireland, there was a gap in RURM training infrastructure. The Research Culture Team at University College Dublin led a coalition to develop a National open educational resource (OER) intended to raise awareness of RURM within the Irish research system and to guide evaluators involved in recruitment, research assessment and career progression.

Methods
A co-design process was used to identify needs/priorities of the intended audience, preferred delivery method, and effective engagement mechanisms for this topic. Five focus groups were conducted with coalition research communities (n=124) across Ireland. Participants (n=92) then beta-tested the draft module. Voluntary quantitative and qualitative feedback (n=57) was collected on relevance to discipline areas, knowledge confirmation activities, and content delivery mechanisms.

Results-Conclusion
Workshops revealed only moderate levels of understanding about research metrics (44% reported little or no familiarity with RURM), making foundational knowledge essential content. Recognising the value and limits of all types of research assessment was considered vital for making fair evaluations. Tools and guidance to apply research metrics appropriately in consideration of discipline, career stage, and diversity of output/contribution was a priority. Most (88%) found the module was relevant to their disciplines, easy to navigate, and well-structured (83%), allowing users to quickly find the information (79%). User data will serve as future indicators of changes in assessment practice and research culture across Ireland.

P.102

Collaborative Pilot of Core Reproducibility Checks in Research: Applicability and Implementation Across Scientific Fields

*Constant Vinatier[1], Dr. Toivo Glatz[4], Omeralfaroug Al Ali[5], István Kertész[6], Marianna Laviola[7], Clara Sanchez-Izquierdo Lozano[8], Alfredo Sanchez-Tojar[9], Jessica Rohmann[4], Leonhard Held[10], Susanne Schorr[11], Mónika Varga[12], **Dr. Florian Naudet**[1,3], Rita Banzi[2]*

[1]University of Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail)-UMR_S 1085, CIC 1414 (Centre of Clinical Investigation of Rennes), Rennes, France, [2]Laboratory for Health Regulatory Policies, Mario Negri Institute for Pharmacological Research IRCCS, Milan, Italy, [3]Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, France, [4]Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany, [5]MATE, Department of Physiology and Animal Health, Hungary, [6]Institute of Food Science and Technology, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Buda Campus, Hungary, [7]Italian Institute of Technology, Italy, [8]University of Edinburgh, UK, [9]Bielefeld University, Germany, [10]University of Zurich, Switzerland, [11]QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany, [12]Institute of Animal Sciences, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 40 Guba S, 7400 Kaposvar, Hungaria

The Open Science to Increase Reproducibility in Science (OSIRIS) Delphi study reached consensus on a list of 32 items considered important for reproducibility throughout the life cycle of research work. We planned a collaborative pilot test to explore the applicability of these items by different scientific communities, develop guidance and maximize the uptake of the checklist.

At least ten pairs of researchers, not previously involved in the OSIRIS project, will be engaged for the study. We aim to include a diverse range of scientific disciplines, research type (basic, applied, qualitative, quantitative, etc.), stage of career, and country. Each pair of evaluators will independently apply the list of checks to articles in their field, then discuss disagreement and suggest item adaptation or modification to facilitate implementation in the specific field. The target sample of articles is 25.

The project kicked off in September at the Responsible Research in Practice Unconference in Berlin and is ongoing. During the meeting nine evaluators tested the list of items on three articles, providing comments and suggestions for better explanations of several items. Other evaluators are currently recruited through the OSIRIS reproducibility network, national reproducibility networks, and other channels.

The final output of the study will be an elaboration and explanation document to support the concrete implementation of the checklist. This guidance will include 1) explanations of each item to support its use; 2) concrete examples co-developed with participants; and 3) recommendations for adapting the checks to different fields and types of research, if needed.

P.104

Development of an Evidence-Based Reporting Guideline: Guidance List for repOrting Bibliometric AnaLyses (GLOBAL)

Dr. Jeremy Y Ng[1,2,3,4], *Mr. Henry Liu*[1], *Ms. Mehvish Masood*[1], *Ms. Niveen Syed*[1], *Ms. Dalia Zubashev*[1], *Dr. Michel Sabé*[5,6], *Dr. Marco Solmi*[7,8,9,10,11], *Dr. Dimity Stephen*[12], *Jens Peter Andersen*[13], *Dr. Lutz Bornmann*[14], *Dr. Rodrigo Costas*[15], *Ms. Marianne Gauffriau*[16], *Dr. Wolfgang Glänzel*[17], *Dr. Sybille Hinze*[18], *Dr. Cameron Neylon*[19], *Dr. Nicolas Robinson-Garcia*[20], *Mr. Alexander Schniedermann*[12], *Dr. Gunnar Sivertsen*[21], *Dr. Stephan Stahlschmidt*[12], *Dr. Thed van Leeuwen*[15], *Ms. Verena Weimer*[22], *Mr. Simon Willemin*[23], *Dr. Erija Yan*[24], *Dr. Alesia Zuccala*[25], *Prof David Moher*[1,10], *Dr. Ludo Waltman*[15], *Dr. Stefanie Haustein*[26,27,28]

[1]*Centre for Journalology, Ottawa Methods Centre, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada,* [2]*Institute of General Practice and Interprofessional Care, University Hospital Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany,* [3]*Robert Bosch Center for Integrative Medicine and Health, Bosch Health Campus, Stuttgart, Germany,* [4]*Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada,* [5]*Division of Adult Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, University Hospitals of Geneva, Thonex, Switzerland,* [6]*Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland,* [7]*Department of Psychiatry, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [8]*Department of Mental Health, The Ottawa Hospital, Ottawa, Canada,* [9]*Clinical Epidemiology Program, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [10]*School of Epidemiology and Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [11]*Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin, Germany,* [12]*German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Berlin, Germany,* [13]*Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark,* [14]*Administrative Headquarters of the Max Planck Society, Munich, Germany,* [15]*Centre for Science and Technology Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands,* [16]*IT University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark,* [17]*ECOOM - Research and Development Monitoring Research Centre, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium,* [18]*Center for Open and Responsible Research, Berlin University Alliance, Berlin, Germany,* [19]*Centre for Culture and Technology, Curtin University, Perth, Australia,* [20]*Department of Information and Communication, University of Granada, Granada, Spain,* [21]*Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, Oslo, Norway,* [22]*Department of Information Centre for Education, Leibniz Institute for Research and Information in Education, Frankfurt am Main, Germany,* [23]*ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland,* [24]*Department of Information Science, Drexel University, Philadelphia, United States of America,* [25]*Department of Communication, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark,* [26]*School of Information Studies, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada,* [27]*Scholarly Communications Lab, Ottawa/Vancouver, Canada,* [28]*Centre Interuniversitaire de Recherche sur la Science et la Technologie, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal, Canada*

Objective

Bibliometric analyses are frequently used to evaluate research trends, scientific cooperation, publication output, and citation impact across scientific disciplines. However, the absence of standardized reporting guidance has led to variability in their quality, transparency, reproducibility, and completeness. To address this issue, we have developed the Guidance List for the repOrting of Bibliometric AnaLyses (GLOBAL), an evidence-based reporting guideline intended to improve the quality and consistency of bibliometric reporting.

Method

Following the EQUATOR Network's recommendations (https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/), a list of reporting items was generated through a scoping review and refined using a two-round Delphi. Round 1 was an international online survey (10 July-16 August 2024, Welphi.com), completed by bibliometricians, librarians, journal editors, professors, and researchers. Participants rated items on a 9-point Likert scale for importance, and open-ended feedback underwent content analysis (identifying common themes) to draft new items. Round 2 was an in-person consensus meeting (21 September 2024, Germany) to discuss unresolved and newly proposed items. Participants voted to include or exclude an item, or abstained from voting. Consensus was defined as ≥80% agreement. An Explanation and Elaboration (E&E) document is also being developed to clarify item expectations and provide practical examples. Authors, including Round 2 participants, have reviewed both documents, and pilot testing is underway to assess applicability.

Results
scoping review produced 32 items, which 145 participants evaluated in the first Delphi round. Twenty-four items achieved consensus for inclusion, and content analysis yielded one additional item. In Round 2, 16 participants discussed ten items (eight unresolved, one split into two, and one new). Seven items were rephrased. Five items reached consensus for inclusion, four for exclusion, and one was excluded for lack of consensus. The final GLOBAL checklist comprises 29 items. The checklist and E&E document are undergoing finalization via pilot-testing, with results available at the time of the conference.

Conclusion
The 29-item GLOBAL checklist provides structured, evidence-based guidance for reporting bibliometric analyses. Its adoption is expected to improve the quality, transparency, completeness, and reproducibility of bibliometric analyses. Methodological considerations include the variability in how bibliometric analyses are defined, influencing our criteria for selecting papers during the scoping review.

P.106

SPIN in Systematic Reviews on the Management of Caries Lesions in Children and Adolescents: A Meta-Research Study

Sra. Lívia Oliveira[1], *Marina Letícia de Paula*[1], *Rokaia Ahmed Ahmed Khairi E Elagami*[1], *Prof. Dr. Tamara Tedesco*[1], *Dr Daniela Raggio*[1]
[1]*Faculty of Dentistry, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

Early childhood caries is a chronic condition that affects children's health and quality of life. The choice between non-invasive, micro-invasive, invasive, or mixed treatment approaches should be based on scientific evidence. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses play a key role in synthesizing primary studies results to inform these decisions. Spin bias, or distorted result interpretations, may compromise scientific integrity and influence public policy and clinical judgments. This study aimed to investigate the presence, prevalence, and nature of spin in systematic reviews on the management of caries lesions in children and adolescents. The Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, Embase, ProQuest, and LILACS databases were searched with no time or language restriction. Systematic reviews of caries lesion management in children and adolescents were included. The studies that evaluated cost-effectiveness, diagnostic test accuracy, included special needs patients, and did not show data separated for children and adults were excluded. Data extraction and screening were performed by two independent reviewers. The identification of spin was based on the criteria: the study suggests clinical practice recommendations that aren't supported by data; the title indicates an unproven beneficial effect; adverse events weren't mentioned; non-significant primary outcomes are not included; significant but non-primary outcomes are emphasized; and primary outcomes are overly interpreted as effective. Statistical analysis was performed, significance level 5%. Fifty-three systematic reviews were included. Spin was present in 41.5% of abstracts and 30.1% of full texts, occurring simultaneously in 28.3% of studies. In abstracts, the most common type was the omission of adverse event mention (17%), while in complete texts, clinical recommendations that were not supported by the findings were more common (15.1%). There was no significant association between spin and variables such as abstract format or meta-analysis performed. It is concluded that spin is a recurring bias in systematic reviews on the management of caries lesions in children and adolescents, especially in abstracts. To ensure reliable evidence for clinical practice and public policy formation in pediatric dentistry, these findings highlight the need for increased methodological rigor and transparency in scientific writing.

P.108

Facing the Complexities of AI Ethics by Untraditional Means: Formats and Issues

Hallvard Fossheim[1,2], ***Mr. Thomas Østerhaug***[1]
[1]*National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology (NENT), Norway,* [2]*University of Bergen, Norway*

The recent developments in AI have led to a great demand for ethical guidance on research on AI and the use of AI in research. In this situation, there is also a need for reflection that goes beyond guidelines.

The Norwegian National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology (NENT) is an advisory body for research ethics and research integrity (RE/RI). In order to respond to the demand for ethical reflection as well as guidelines, NENT is in the process of editing an anthology on AI related RE/RI issues. This presentation will give an outline of the most burning issues covered by the anthology, as well as of the justifications for using the anthology format for developing research ethics and research integrity.

The anthology format offers an opportunity to reflect on demanding issues, in a way that guidelines or codes of conduct do not. This is especially important in partially uncharted, highly complex topics like AI in research. The format opens a room for problematizing cases that have no easy fix, addressing the complexity of a new reality, and discussing the opportunities and challenges AI raises for research ethics and research integrity.

The articles in the anthology are both directed towards and authored by researchers from a broad variety of fields. Accordingly, the anthology offers a range of perspectives on ethical challenges, broadly organized in four categories:

1. The independence and openness of research. How, and to what extent, can this be ensured, given that much of the development is driven by strong political and commercial interests?

2. Research-internal norms. How can we best re-articulate our research ethical norms given the drastic alterations in research practices?

3. Personal integrity and human dignity. With a view to, e.g., consent and personal data, how do we uphold respect for individuals and groups within new technological frameworks?

4. Society and nature. In light of potential consequences, how should we best carve out a reasonable and functioning division of responsibilities?

In our presentation, we will share the main findings on each of these points.

P.110

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviors Regarding Questionable Research Practices Among Ukrainian Researchers: We Need to Start Somewhere

Mrs. Solomiya Paryzhak[1,2], ***Mrs. Tetiana Dumych***[1,2], *Dr. Emily Anderson*[1]
[1]*Neiswanger Institute for Bioethics and Healthcare Leadership, Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University Chicago, CHICAGO, USA,* [2]*Danylo Halytsky Lviv National Medical University, LVIV, Ukraine*

Objective
This study will examine the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of Ukrainian researchers related to the responsible conduct of research (RCR) and questionable research practices (QRPs). We are not aware of any similar published empirical study in Ukraine. This information is needed to guide development of institutional policies and programs for RCR) education as well as for the reporting and investigation of research misconduct.

Methods
A questionnaire addressing knowledge, attitudes, observed or suspected misconduct, self-reported behavior, and the research environment related to behaviors defined by expert consensus as misconduct or QRPs will be distributed via social media networks to Ukrainian biomedical, social, natural scientists, and mathematics researchers. Several previously validated scales will be included.

Results
We do not yet have results. We plan to obtain IRB approval, register our study, and begin distributing the survey by early January, leaving it open for approximately 6-8 weeks. By the March 3 early bird registration deadline, we will know whether we have sufficient data for preliminary analyses. We will explore correlations between knowledge and attitudes toward QRPs and self-reported observation of or engagement in these behaviors. We will also explore the relationship between knowledge, attitudes, and observed and individual behaviors with demographic and contextual variables, such as age, academic environment (including formal RCR training), and engagement in international collaborations.
Several hypotheses will guide our analyses: 1) younger Ukrainian researchers, who were educated after the implementation of scientific integrity reforms, will demonstrate greater awareness of and lower tolerance for QRPs compared to older generations educated in Soviet or early post-Soviet systems; 2) Ukrainian researchers engaged in international collaborations, which have increased since the 2022 Russian full-scale invasion, will have higher awareness of QRPs and more positive attitudes regarding the importance of avoiding QRPs; and 3) environmental factors such as availability of mentors and other resources (positive) or perceptions that institutional peers are engaging in misconduct (negative) will be correlated with attitudes and behavior.

Conclusion
Our anticipated findings will contribute to understanding how generational, institutional, and international factors interact to shape research integrity among Ukrainian academics during times of crisis and reform.

P.112

PhD Candidates' Perceptions of the 2023 ALLEA Standards for Good Research Practices: Clarity and Relevance of the Standards and Frequency and Seriousness of Non-Adherence — A Cross-Sectional Study

Mr. Lodewijk Pet[1], *Prof. Frits Rosendaal*[1], *Bob Siegerink*[1,2]
[1]*Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands, Leiden, Netherlands,* [2]*Directorate of Research Policy, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands, Leiden, Netherlands*

Background
PhD candidates carry out a large share of daily scientific work and contribute substantially to research output. The 2023 European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA) states 46 standards intended to guide early-career researchers. These standards are informally used by committees when assessing conduct. Little is known about how those subject to the code perceive the clarity, relevance, and non-adherence of these standards. We therefore asked: how do PhD candidates evaluate the ALLEA standards on these dimensions?

Methods
We conducted a cross-sectional survey among 398 PhD candidates (76% response rate) from the Faculties of Medicine and Science at Leiden University; these faculties host the majority of PhD candidates at Leiden University. Each respondent evaluated a random subset of 23 of the 46 standards on clarity, relevance, and frequency of non-adherence using a five-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 5 = very). Perceived seriousness of non-adherence was rated on a three-point scale (1 = misconduct; 2 = questionable; 3 = minor shortcoming; lower scores indicate greater seriousness). Additionally, participants were asked to formulate their three most important research practices; free-text responses were coded into keyword categories.

Results
The 46 standards were seen as clear and relevant, with mean scores ranging from 3.4–4.8 (clarity) and 3.3–4.7 (relevance). Non-adherence was uncommon but not absent: non-adherence was reported as frequent for every standard by ate least 1% and at most 21% of respondents, and at least one participant reported experiencing or observing non-compliance for every standard. Standards related to research safeguards were viewed as most serious, whereas those regarding training and supervision were seen as less serious. Perceptions did not differ evidently between faculties. In the free-text items, keywords related to "honesty" were mentioned most often.

Conclusions
PhD candidates consider the ALLEA standards clear and relevant, yet some domains—particularly safeguards—attract higher perceived seriousness when not adhered to. These findings support targeted training that emphasizes safeguards and suggest that supervision-related standards may benefit from crisper articulation. Embedding the standards explicitly in RCR curricula and onboarding activities may help align expectations and shape early-career researchers' daily research practices.

P.114

Developing the GRRAS-COSMIN Reporting Guidelines for Studies on Reliability, Agreement, and Measurement Error

Dr. Merle-Marie Pittelkow[1,2], *Maximilian Mönch*[3], *Dr Lidwine B Mokkink*[4,5], *Dr David L. Streiner*[6], *Dr Stig Brorson*[7], *Dr Mohamed Shoukri*[8,9], *Dr Jan Kottner*[1]

[1]Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Institute of Clinical Nursing Science, Berlin, Germany, [2]QUEST Center for Responsible Research, , Berlin Institute of Health at Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany, [3]Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institute of Biometry and Clinical Epidemiology, Berlin, Germany, [4]Amsterdam UMC, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, [5]Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Methodology, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, [6]Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada, [7]Centre for Evidence-Based Orthopaedics, Zealand University Hospital and Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark, [8]Biostatistics and Scientific Computing Department, King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Centre, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, [9]Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Western Ontari, London, Canada

Objective

Reliability and agreement/measurement error are essential for judging the quality of scores obtained by measurement instruments, and by extension impact the quality of research and practice. The Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS) were developed to improve the completeness and transparency of reporting of reliability and agreement/measurement error of health measurements. Since their publication in 2011 methodological standards for reporting guideline development and reliability, agreement/measurement error studies have advanced. Moreover, related initiatives like COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN) have emerged, offering opportunities to harmonize terminology and promote consistency across initiatives and tools. We aim to update and develop the GRRAS-COSMIN Reporting Guidelines for Studies on Reliability, Agreement, and Measurement Error aligned with the methodological standards established by the EQUATOR Network.

Methods

We are conducting a methods review of literature from the last decade that critiques or evaluates GRRAS, or offers methodological recommendations relevant to reliability, agreement, and measurement error reporting (Pittelkow et al. 2025). Findings will be discussed by a steering committee of methodologists, statisticians, content experts, and representatives from both GRRAS and COSMIN. The committee will revise the original GRRAS items to create a draft of the updated guidelines. This draft will then be refined through a Delphi process with international researchers experienced in conducting, reviewing, or publishing studies on reliability and/or agreement/measurement error. At least two Delphi rounds will be conducted to establish consensus.

Results

The protocols for the methods review is published as a preprint (Pittelkow et al. 2025) and the Delphi study protocol will be registered on the Open Science Framework. Screening for the methods review is ongoing. By May 2025, we expect to present findings from the review and a revised version of the original GRRAS.

Conclusion

Transparent reporting not only support accurate manuscript preparation but also enhance study design when considered early, such as during protocol development. The updated GRRAS-COSMIN guidelines will ensure that reliability, agreement, and measurement error studies are reported with sufficient detail for readers to support reproduction and replication of the results and assess methodological quality, thereby advancing both transparency and research practice.

P.116

Developing a Train-the-Trainer Model for Responsible Use of Generative AI by Researchers

Dr Andrew Porter[1]
[1]Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom, [2]University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

While specialist Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools have been widely used in research for decades, the advent of commercial Generative AI systems has highlighted an urgent need for training and guidance across a wider cohort of researchers.

Organisations including Russell Group universities in the UK have shared broad policy aims such as "Generative AI tools can be used for the benefit of students and staff" and "It is important that all students and staff understand the opportunities, limitations and ethical issues associated with the use of these tools" but the outworking of this for individual researchers and teams is complex and highly context-dependent.

My training programmes and writing have focused on delivering pragmatic, researcher-centric guidance and space for reflection so that researchers can develop their own framework for Generative AI use that is within University, funder and national guidelines.

In this poster I will share the approach developed at the Cancer Research UK Manchester Institute and the University of Manchester to create a hands-on training for researchers that helps them explore the possibilities and pitfalls of Generative AI use. This includes structured interactions with Generative AI tools which draw on subject knowledge which the participants hold (and are therefore able to judge the usefulness and accuracy of the outputs) alongside areas outside their experience (where they are prompted to consider how they would evaluate these outputs). Questions provided throughout the training ask the researchers to reflect on the usefulness, accuracy and appropriateness of using Generative AI for different tasks.

Running these as small group sessions provides space for conversation and reflection, which produces good feedback from attendees but limits the overall reach of the course. Subsequently, this course has been refined into a Train-the-Trainer model, where researcher developers and trainers can use the materials in their own setting to lead the courses themselves. The steps for developing this approach will be covered in the poster, which will also include feedback from participants.

P.118

Equity and Integrity in Emergency Public Health Response for Indigenous Populations in Bangladesh: Lived Experiences to Recommendations

Dr. Farah Naz Rahman[1,2], *Professor Saidur Rahman Mashreky*[3]
[1]*International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research Bangladesh (icddr,b), Bangladesh,* [2]*Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Australia,* [3]*Centre for Injury Prevention and Research Bangladesh (CIPRB), Bangladesh*

Background
Indigenous populations have historically faced structural barriers to essential services, and public health crises can intensify these inequities, raising concerns for equity and integrity. This study explored the experiences of an Indigenous community in Bangladesh in accessing health and education services during COVID-19, and presented mitigation strategies to promote integrity in research and public health programs.

Methods
We conducted eight in-depth interviews in 2020-2021 with Indigenous community members in Moulvibazar, Bangladesh who had sought healthcare during COVID-19 and had school-going children. Findings were deliberated in a stakeholder workshop to co-formulate strategies for meaningful inclusion. Inductive thematic analysis was interpreted through human rights-based approach framework: availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality of services (AAAQ), participation and empowerment, equality and non-discrimination, and accountability.

Results
Under Availability and Accessibility theme, respondents informed fragile primary care access, and digital divides. Health care and schooling options remained limited for Indigenous families as distance-learning options and devices were scarce, and network coverage was unreliable. Acceptability and quality theme revealed: national risk messages were not translated or culturally adapted, limiting comprehension and consistent prevention; clinic interactions were often not culturally safe. Communities were rarely engaged in designing communication or service changes, curtailing local ownership. Limited involvement of Indigenous peoples in program design and communication plausibly amplified inequities in risk perception, preventive practices, and service uptake. Stakeholder workshop highlighted the need for co designed, locally stewarded, multilingual public health response with Indigenous participation in design and evaluation. Recommendations included standing community advisory committees with decision authority for outreach and communication, and small grants to support community-led solutions. Suggested measures included disaggregated monitoring, rights-compliant mechanisms, and public reporting on remedies.

Conclusion
Limited consideration of Indigenous inclusion during health emergencies has measurable consequences for awareness, prevention, and service uptake. Ethical practice requires culturally safe response that is co created with Indigenous communities. Future emergency programs in Bangladesh should operationalize Indigenous cultural safety, community governance, and data stewardship from protocol inception, and pair research with consented referral and feedback loops so that participation yields tangible benefits while preserving dignity and autonomy.

P.120

Expanding Access to Post-Publication Peer Review with COSIG, the Collection of Open Science Integrity Guides

Yagmur Ozturk[2], ***Dr. Solal Pirelli***[3], ***Dr. Reese Richardson***[1]
[1]Northwestern University, Evanston, USA, [2]Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France, [3]École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

The emerging practice of post-publication peer review (PPPR) has proven essential for exposing paper mill activity and other instances of scientific fraud. Research professionals and non-specialists alike can perform effective PPPR. However, investigating the integrity of the published scientific literature often requires domain-specific knowledge and investigative methods that not everyone has.

The Collection of Open Science Integrity Guides (COSIG, https://cosig.net) is a constantly-expanding collection of accessible guides written by post-publication peer reviewers, publication integrity experts, and career scientists sharing best practices and tutorials for conducting PPPR. The goal of COSIG is to make PPPR accessible to more scientists as well as provide research integrity officers, funding bodies, librarians, and journal editors with reference and training material for investigating common publication integrity issues.

COSIG was launched in June 2025 and currently features 31 guides covering topics including general best practices for PPPR, effective use of the PPPR platform PubPeer, validation of reagents in biomedical studies, fact-checking of common results in materials science and engineering studies, and spotting errors in systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Guides in COSIG address common criticisms of PPPR by documenting and explaining the scientific roots of common publication integrity concerns.

COSIG is an open source project with an open call for contributions and is distributable under a CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license. At present, 18 individuals have contributed to COSIG. Contributions to the official version are reviewed by project maintainers in consultation with relevant experts. COSIG is written in English with plans to translate guides into multiple languages.

This presentation will detail our motivations for creating COSIG, highlight specific guides and summarize future plans to expand COSIG itself and COSIG's user and contributor community.

P.122

A Practical Resource to Support Funders to Promote Transparency in Clinical Trials

Ms. Maia Salholz-Hillel[1], ***Dr. Friederike Kohrs***[1], *Samruddhi Yerunkar*[1], ***Dr. Delwen Franzen***[1]
[1]*BIH-QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany*

Research integrity relies on transparency to enable critical appraisal, reduce bias, and foster a trustworthy evidence base. This is particularly important for clinical trials, where research directly informs medical decision-making and involves human participants. When information about trials is incomplete, delayed, or inaccessible, it undermines evidence synthesis and distorts our understanding of the effectiveness of medical therapies.

Several stakeholder groups in the research system hold important and complementary levers to advance trial transparency in practice, including funders, institutions, and regulators. Research funders are uniquely positioned to drive systemic improvements in trial transparency through their policies, grant evaluation processes, compliance monitoring, and sector-wide influence. Our interview study with international funders revealed that while many recognize their role in supporting transparency and have adopted policies to promote specific practices, funders often lack practical resources to effectively support consistent implementation and monitoring of trial transparency requirements.

Through a bottom-up, participatory approach, we are developing a practical resource to strengthen funders' capacity to promote clinical trial transparency. The development of the resource was informed by interviews and co-creation workshops with international non-commercial trial funders and other relevant stakeholders, including trial registries and clinical investigators. The prototype of the resource is now being refined through ongoing collaboration with funders and the wider research community.

Our poster will present the resource, showcasing its features, functionality, and potential applications. We will also highlight the co-creative, participatory development process and share early feedback on usability, feasibility, and impact. We invite conference participants to explore the resource, discuss its use in practice, and contribute ideas to guide its continued development and broader adoption to strengthen research integrity. We also hope to use the opportunity for meaningful exchange on the maintenance and sustainability of community-driven tools for research integrity in general.

P.124

Managing the Downstream Legal Implications of AI-Based Research Integrity Allegations

Mrs. Christine Savage[1]
[1]*Choate Hall & Stewart, Boston, USA*

The use of AI tools to identify data anomalies and potential research misconduct has led to significant growth in assertions of breaches of research integrity and increased infrastructure and staffing needs at research institutions, journals, and government agencies to address those assertions. In a short period, we've evolved from an environment where potential misconduct most often was uncovered by fellow lab members, peer reviewers, or other scientists who couldn't replicate results, to potential misconduct being uncovered by algorithms which, while incredibly powerful, cannot easily account for the limits of historical research methods, human judgment, poor image quality, the unavailability of original records for older research, or someone's intent or motivation.

If an AI tool identifies a possible data duplication or manipulation, the resulting report not only can spur questions in the lab or an institutional research misconduct review process, but can also serve as the initial basis for a whistleblower lawsuit or law enforcement action alleging false statements, false claims, or other fraud. Having a roadmap or list of considerations at the ready when there are parallel research integrity/legal investigations may help institutions achieve better legal or financial outcomes and reduce forward-looking risk. We'll walk through key considerations that institutions should keep in mind, including the fact that there are constituencies – including the government, private sponsors, and courts – that may not be willing to wait for the resolution of standard research misconduct inquiries/investigations.

These considerations include:

- Private funder contractual obligations including notification of research integrity allegations
- Government funding – statements made in biosketches, applications and progress reports
- Patents and licensing agreements
- Publication corrections
- Individual donors
- Laboratory operations
- Data hygiene
- Credentialing for clinician researchers

P.126

Is There a Must in Art at Universities? Integrity in Artistic Studies, Teaching, and Research at Universities of the Arts

Mr Markus Seethaler, *Mrs. Anna-Katharina Rothwangl[1]*, ***Mr Dominik Reisner***
[1]Austrian Federal Ministry of Women, Science and Research, Austria

In 2024, Austria introduced a new legal provision in the Act on Quality Assurance in Higher Education (HS-QSG). This regulation understands integrity in academic and artistic study, teaching, and research as transcending mere compliance with good scientific practice and seeks to cultivate a culture of honesty and quality throughout universities.

Austria has a longstanding tradition of universities of the arts. The law allows not only scientific but also entirely artistic master's and doctoral theses in art studies. The central mission of Austrian universities is to promote both the advancement of scientific research and teaching, and the development and advancement of the arts as well as its teaching. By addressing integrity in both domains, the legislator arguably sought to acknowledge the parallel objectives of universities.

However, universities of the arts have expressed serious concerns that defining "good artistic practice" might pose a significant risk to artistic freedom and expression. Conversely, the competent ministry stressed that its objective is not to define art as such, but to guarantee that artistic practice in the university context fulfills established criteria for academic rigor and integrity.

While the introduction of these regulations has led to notable controversy, it has also initiated a constructive dialogue among all universities of the arts in Austria, as well as other stakeholders, under the moderation of the ministry. This ongoing discussion aims to foster a shared understanding of integrity and explore how to define good artistic practice within university contexts.

Integrity in study, teaching and research of the arts faces challenges different from scientific integrity. A clear definition of rules and regulations is not necessarily possible for the arts. Artistic expression due its nature may include the disregard for or the breaking of certain rules. Nevertheless, the process also demonstrated that common characteristics defining good artistic practice can be identified and articulated.

This presentation will outline the process towards reaching a shared understanding of integrity in artistic academic environments. It will detail the development process, initial outcomes from the ministry's perspective, and describe implemented changes by universities.

P.128

Originality, Borrowing, and Ethics: A Critical Examination of Plagiarism

Dr. Anbu Selvi S[1]
[1]*Lady Doak College, Tamil Nadu, India, Madurai, India*

This paper re-examines the idea of plagiarism by going beyond its modern meaning as a moral or academic mistake. Today, plagiarism is mostly seen as copying someone's work without credit, but in earlier times, borrowing and reusing ideas were often viewed as normal and even valuable ways to share and continue knowledge. Many old traditions encouraged imitation and adaptation as a sign of respect for the original and as a way to create something new.

In present academic life, plagiarism is usually measured by a software report that shows a percentage of similarity. This has made plagiarism a number to be reduced, instead of a concept to be understood. Such a view ignores the deeper questions about creativity, influence, and collective learning. A deeper understanding of plagiarism can help reduce major research concerns such as duplication of content, self-plagiarism, redundant publication, and excessive textual similarity. It can also promote genuine originality, reflective thinking, and meaningful knowledge creation.

By questioning the modern idea of authorship and originality, this paper argues that our strict rules about plagiarism come from a particular time in history, the Enlightenment, when people began to value individual genius and copyright laws became important. Examples from world literature show how older cultures accepted reinterpretation as a creative act. The Ramayana tradition, from Valmiki's Sanskrit version to Kamban's Ramavataram and Tulsidas's Ramcharitmanas, shows how retelling the same story added new meanings based on regional culture and devotion. Similarly, the many Gospels of the New Testament reflect a belief that truth could be expressed in many voices.

The Study is a Qualitative, conceptual, and historical research with an analytical focus on the evolution and ethics of plagiarism. The paper concludes that borrowing done with respect or for learning should not be confused with copying meant to deceive. Seeing plagiarism only as a percentage hides its cultural and ethical depth. Understanding the past ways of reusing texts can help us build a more thoughtful and balanced approach to originality and creativity today.

P.130

Identity Theft in Computer Science Peer Review

Prof. Nihar Shah[1], *Melisa Bok, Xukun Liu, Prof. Andrew McCallum*
[1]*Carnegie Mellon University,*

Institutional email addresses are often regarded as reliable proof of academic identity. Our recent investigation finds that this assumption can be systematically exploited. OpenReview.net is a nonprofit peer-reviewing platform providing supporting over 2000 peer-review venues, including most major artificial intelligence venues. OpenReview staff have uncovered 94 fraudulent reviewer profiles, where a dishonest researcher employs the following modus operandi:

- A dishonest researcher impersonates another researcher while registering as a reviewer, using an email address resembling that of the other researcher but controlled by the dishonest researcher.
- The dishonest researcher under this fraudulent identity then attempts to game the reviewer-assignment system to review papers authored by their true identity.
- Once assigned, the dishonest researcher—as the reviewer under their false identity—provides favorable reviews to the papers authored by their true identity.

Another variant is a "collusion ring," where this dishonest researcher, using the false identity, favorably reviews their co-conspirators' work in exchange for some quid-pro-quo.

One prospective remedy is to mandate the use of institutional email addresses as a pseudo-identity, and verify that the provided affiliations correspond with the domain of the email. However, all 94 fake profiles used round-trip-verified institutional email addresses, meaning that OpenReview sent verification links and users confirmed control of that email address. Of these, 92 belonged to reputable universities, and two used ".edu" domains of defunct institutions. In many cases, the fraudsters exploited universities' practice of allowing members or visitors to create email aliases:

- The dishonest researcher gained access to an email of a trusted institution, and created email alias(es) resembling someone else at that institution. Alternatively, the dishonest researcher may ask a co-conspirator at another institution to create such an alias.

- The dishonest researcher then signed up to review using the other person's identity and the aforementioned email address, by employing the modus operandi outlined earlier.

This bypasses further checks on whether the email pertains to the domain of the claimed affiliation.

We recommend that peer-review platforms and universities implement stricter controls on alias creation, active monitoring of institutional domains, and enhanced linkage between reviewer accounts and verified authorship records.

P.132

Ethics and Integrity in Research in the Final Undergraduate Projects of the Teacher Education Program in Pedagogy at the Federal University of Alagoas

Sr. Flávio Silva[1], *Sr. Luis Paulo Leopoldo Mercado Luis Paulo Mercado*[2]
[1]*Instituto Federal da Bahia, Feira de Santana, Brazil,* [2]*Universidade Federal de Alagoas, Feira de Santana, Brasil*

In various educational environments, two important groups of users, teachers and students employ Digital Information and Communication Technologies (DICT), but a lack of knowledge or improper use of these technologies can lead to plagiarism. The issue of plagiarism is currently being debated, especially with the advent of programs that utilize Artificial Intelligence (AI). This thesis aims to analyze the incidence of academic plagiarism in final papers (FP) from the Pedagogy program at the Federal University of Alagoas (UFAL) – Campus A/C Simões, in the both modes learning education presential and distance, as available in the Institutional Repository (RIUFAL). The study uses an applied research methodology, focusing on an analysis of the impact of the pandemic and AI on promoting academic plagiarism within the course in question. The selection criteria for the FP included graduates with approved and published works in RIUFAL. The FP sample was stratified by year from 2015 to 2024. Two programs were used for academic plagiarism analysis: Farejador de Plágio and Plagius. The reports generated by these programs were observed and compared with the institution's guiding documents for research ethics and integrity, and then cataloged in an observation sheet. The analysis results indicate that mechanisms such as Bing and Google Scholar were the most accessed. Evidence was found that Brazilian students use websites like BrasilEscola, QConcursos, Bloglines, and Wikipedia to help with scientific writing. Furthermore, authorship errors were found with the use of citations that did not follow the standards of the Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas (ABNT). In the analyses for AI-generated text, there was a significant increase in AI use during the pandemic, with a reduction in 2022 as a result of the guidance provided in class upon returning to in-person activities. During the data collection phase, some limitations were identified: the lack of updated data in the institutional repository and the significant advances in chatbot algorithms for scientific writing, which make plagiarism detection more difficult. The relevance of this study is evident, as technology constantly evolves, and it serves as a valuable resource for understanding graduates' textual production outcomes.

P.134

Experiences From the First Years of the National Board for Assessment of Research Misconduct

Dr. Dorota Green[1], Dr. Magnus Eklund, ***Mr. Jonas Jeppson****,* ***Mr. Magnus Gudmundsson****,* ***Dr. Daniel Söderström***
[1]Npof, Sweden

Since January 2020, research misconduct has been a legal matter in Sweden. Reported allegations of fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism (ffp) are since then investigated and assessed by a national governmental authority: The National Board for Assessment of Research Misconduct (Npof). Other allegations of research misconduct are assessed locally by the employer of the accused researcher, e.g. a University or a healthcare provider, like before.
Part of the Boards assignment is to produce a yearly report where the statistics and short accounts of all the ffp allegations handled by the Board, and other allegations handled by the local employers, are presented. In our presentation, we will give an overview of the experiences presented in the reports from the first six years since the law came into effect
Before Npof, decisions concerning research misconduct could not be appealed. With the current system, the Boards decisions can be appealed to the Swedish administrative courts. We will also present some of our experiences from how research misconduct has been dealt with by the courts.

P.136

Equity in Open Science: A Scoping Review on Conceptual Diversity

*Mrs. Iara Machado[1], Sr. Gustavo Fernandes Lima[1], Sr. Rozemberg Falcão E Silva Alves[1], PhD Dirce Bellezi Guilhem[1], **MsC Rafaelly Stavalle**[1,2,3,4]*
[1]University of Brasília - UnB, Brasília, Brazil, [2]Federal University of São Paulo - UNIFESP, São Paulo, Brazil, [3]Science Integrity Alliance, USA, [4]Brazilian Reproducibility Network, Brasília, Brazil

Objective
To map and analyze how the concept of equity has been defined, interpreted, and applied within the context of Open Science, identifying theoretical perspectives, domains of application, and implications for research integrity and global access to knowledge.

Method
This is a secondary analysis of a scoping review registered on the Open Science Framework (OSF) under DOI https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/JSQXD, conducted in accordance with the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-SCR) guidelines. The screening was based on inclusion criteria that required an explicit discussion of equity or related terms in connection with Open Science. This screening stage has been completed. The work is currently in the data extraction and analysis phase for a qualitative and discourse analysis. Extracted data are being organized into structured spreadsheets to form the corpus. This corpus will then be analyzed using the IRaMuTeQ software, which performs Descending Hierarchical Classification (DHC) and semantic meaning class formation. This lexical analysis approach will enable the identification of lexical patterns and the meaning attributed to the relevant terms, resulting in the construction of a comprehensive interpretive analytical corpus.

Results
This research is under the analysis phase through Iramuteq, and therefore, the full results will be presented at the conference upon completion of the study. This submission serves to detail the methodological rigor employed and the study's potential to comprehensively map the conceptual applications of equity in Open Science. The complete findings, including the Descending Hierarchical Classification (DHC) and the identification of thematic clusters, will be the focus of the final presentation.

Conclusion
The rigorous conduction of this scoping review is fundamental for thoroughly mapping the epistemological plurality surrounding the concept of equity in Open Science. The focus of this presentation is the robust methodology and the potential contribution of the study, which, upon its conclusion, will provide essential subsidies for developing context-sensitive conceptual and operational frameworks, promoting more equitable, reproducible, and socially responsible scientific practices.

Descriptors: Open Science; Equity; Research Integrity; Scoping Review.

P.138

The Development of a Core Outcome Set to Evaluate Interventions That May Improve Reproducibility

Dr. Inge Stegeman[1], *Prof. Mariska Leeflang*[2], *Dr. Tony Ross Hellauer*[3], *Dr. Joeri Tijdink*[2], *Kimberley Wever*[4], *Rachel Heyard*[5], *Dr. Florian Naudet*[6]
[1]*Umc Utrecht, Netherlands,* [2]*Amsterdam UMC, the Netherlands,* [3]*KNOW center, Austria,* [4]*Radboud university, The Netherlands,* [5]*Center for Reproducible Science and Research Synthesis, Zurich, Switserland,* [6]*INSERM, France*

The scientific community is developing interventions to ensure or improve the reproducibility of research output, in order to help researchers to make their scientific output more reproducible. These new interventions need to be evaluated for their effectiveness, because it is crucial to assess whether these interventions produce the intended effects before they are widely implemented. However, to date there is no consensus on how to define and measure reproducibility in a way that is both meaningful and generalizable across different research contexts.
Therefore, the aim of this project is to develop a core outcome set for intervention studies aiming to improve reproducibility of empirical studies in the domain of life sciences.
To achieve this aim, we will use a Delhi process. In that process we will first determine how the broad term 'reproducibility' translates to research outcomes and develop a core set of outcomes for studies investigating the effect of interventions to ensure or improve the reproducibility of research. Second, we will determine how these outcomes should be measured. In this presentation we will discuss the first two steps of the Delphi process.

P.142

Retrospective Analysis of Post-Acceptance Authorship Change Requests and Implications for Research Integrity Assessments and Policy

Dr. Matthew Swift[1], *Tiffany Leung*[1,2], *Ms Laurie Thomas*[1], *Ms Swara Patel*[1], *Prof. Gunther Eysenbach*[1,3]
[1]*JMIR Publications, Toronto, Canada,* [2]*Department of Internal Medicine (adjunct), Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Springfield, USA,* [3]*Laboratory for AI and Innovation in Scholarly Communication (LAIISC), School for Health Information Science, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada*

Objective
Following a research integrity case involving post-acceptance, pre-publication changes to authorship an audit was conducted to evaluate overall compliance with JMIR Publications policy on authorship changes which aligns with COPE Guidance, on publications between January 2023 and June 2025. Additional research integrity investigations into articles flagged as non-compliant were then conducted to investigate possible associations between authorship changes and related integrity concerns.

Methods
Publications between January 2023 and June 2025 were checked for changes to authorship metadata post-acceptance. Following data validation, this resulted in the inclusion of 387 articles. Each article was assessed for compliance with JMIR Publications Policy on authorship changes. At the conclusion of the analysis period, flagged articles were examined by Research Integrity staff for related integrity issues pertaining to peer review, integrity of file metadata and author metadata within the submission system.

Results
Of the 387 articles included with analysis, author additions post-acceptance (189, 48.8%) were the most common request followed by deletions (74, 19.1%). The remaining articles were subject to re-order requests or superficial changes to manuscript metadata (e.g., correction of a name misspelling). 123 (31.7%) articles were flagged for non-compliance, with non-compliance being defined as the absence of a fully signed letter requesting the change, lack of adequate reasoning for the change or the absence of fully signed licences to publish. 77 (62.6%) non-compliant articles were addition requests.

Following retrospective analysis of the 123 flagged articles, 26 (21%) were associated with further integrity concerns. Concerns regarding possible peer review manipulation were most commonly identified (17/26, 65.4%) followed by concerns regarding possible evidence of duplicate submission (3/26, 11.5%). The remaining concerns identified related to the presence of tortured phrases and potential ghost authorship. Articles with further integrity concerns were most commonly associated with addition requests (18/26, 69.2%).

Conclusion
Analysis of post-acceptance change requests for policy compliance has revealed an association of non-compliant articles with additional integrity concerns, particularly related to requests for author additions, however the small sample size acts as a potential limitation of this study. An update regarding editorial outcomes is anticipated by WCRI 2026.

P.144

Addressing Emerging Issues in Research Ethics and Integrity Through a Case-Based Approach

*Dr. Kadri Simm[2], Mari-Liisa Parder[2], Ms Heldi Marleen Lang[2], Ms Emmi Kaaya[2], **Dr. Anu Tammeleht**[1,2]*
[1]University Of Helsinki, Finland, [2]University of Tartu, Estonia

Ethics and ethics education have traditionally emphasized individual responsibility in decision-making and actions. While this perspective remains vital, it does not encompass the full complexity of ethical decision-making. Human beings are inherently social creatures whose decisions are shaped not only by personal values but also by the social and situational contexts in which they act. As emerging issues in research ethics and integrity (e.g. the use of AI, ethical issues related to citizen science, rehabilitation of researchers) become increasingly complex, it is essential to explore how individuals navigate moral dilemmas within these environments. To address these aspects, we propose a discussion-based game that uses carefully designed narratives to engage early-career researchers in reflective and context-sensitive ethical reasoning.

The current material focuses on value discussion via games (Parder et al., 2024) and is adapted to research ethics and integrity training. The material is designed to develop competencies needed for dialogic communication, including: 1) skills for listening and responding, 2) openness, 3) empathy, and 4) mutuality orientation (Taylor & Kent, 2014). The aim of the material is not to teach a single "right" answer to the dilemma, but to highlight the potential conflicts between two or more valuable ethical principles to carry out moral reasoning with emphasis on the skills of listening and discussing. The central narratives follow the methodology of Parder et al. (2024), presenting the story through a relatable protagonist's perspective. Characters and their relationships are outlined briefly, allowing trainees to connect the story to their own experiences. Information about motives and time is deliberately limited, encouraging personal interpretation. The dilemma and its pre-given solutions are balanced and neutrally presented, ensuring that each option remains morally acceptable within at least one ethical framework.

The material includes a group-based activity designed to foster ethical competencies. It combines individual tasks – such as taking first personal responsibility by choosing one's own solution – with collaborative work, including discussing the case, proposed solutions, their underlying motivations and values, and potentially reaching a consensus. The material also presents dilemmas in their broader environmental and situational context.

P.146

Navigating Ambiguity and Uncertainty in Research Practice: an Etnographic Study

*Mr. Tom Van Drimmelen[1,2], Dr Nienke Slagboom[1], Prof. Dr. Ria Reis[1,3,4], Prof Lex Bouter[5,6], **Dr. Jackie Thompson**, Dr. Jenny Van der Steen[1,7,8]*

[1]Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands, [2]Metascience Alliance, [3]The Children's Institute, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa, [4]Amsterdam Institute for Global Health and Development, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [5]Amsterdam University Medical Centers, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [6]Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [7]Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, [8]Radboudumc Alzheimer Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Objective
Research integrity guidance often emphasises rules, compliance, and standardised procedures. Yet in everyday practice, researchers encounter situations that resist codification and require discretionary judgement. Responsible conduct of research requires not only recognising when discretion is needed, but also understanding the nature of the choices it entails. Our study explores these aspects of discretionary judgement.

Methods
We conducted twelve months of ethnographic fieldwork (2020–2022) in two end-of-life care research groups in North-West Europe. The first author was embedded full-time in both groups, observing 118 meetings, recording detailed fieldnotes, collecting project documents, and conducting informal and semi-structured interviews. We analysed these data using abductive thematic analysis to examine what prompted discretionary decision-making, and what the decisions consisted of.

Results
Our analysis distinguished two categories of doubt prompting discretion: uncertainty and moral ambiguity, each demanding a different response.

Uncertainty arose when researchers lacked information that would point out a clear best option. We distinguished between concrete uncertainty (e.g., unknown expected recruitment rates, timelines) and interpretational uncertainty (e.g., how to translate or code a participant's statement). Researchers used various strategies to reduce uncertainty – consulting colleagues, drawing on literature, or conducting small tests – but rarely succeeded in eliminating uncertainty, leaving residual doubt and scope for discretion.

Moral ambiguity, by contrast, arose when researchers faced situations with incompatible or incommensurable values. Common tensions included methodological rigour versus care for participants, or openness versus privacy. Another recurring dilemma was how far to probe sensitive questions in interviews, balancing the value of data completeness against the duty of care for vulnerable participants. Unlike uncertainty, such dilemmas could not be resolved by gathering more information; they required active value judgements.

Conclusion
Because uncertainty and moral ambiguity are endemic to research practice, frameworks for responsible conduct of research cannot rest solely on prescriptive rules. They must also strengthen researchers' capacity to recognise when their discretion is required, and the tools to exercise it responsibly. We recommend creating opportunities for reflection, such as moral case deliberation or mentoring, that openly engage with discretionary decisions in practice.

P.148

Open Education, Citizen Science and Youth Inclusion in Research

Dr. Solange Swiri Tumasang[1]
[1]*University of Maroua, Maroua, Cameroon*

This work focuses on redefining access to scientific research and promoting inclusion of youth, particularly women and rural populations, through open education and citizen science initiatives. As noted by scholar Eric Jensen, "When students are actively engaged in scientific inquiry, they develop a deeper understanding of scientific concepts and processes" (Jensen, 2019). Recognizing the potential of marginalized groups to contribute to and benefit from scientific research, this work aims to bridge the gap between scientific communities and local populations. By leveraging digital technologies and innovative pedagogies, this work develops and implements open education programs and citizen science projects that empower youth, especially women and rural dwellers, to participate in scientific research and decision-making processes. Through a mixed-methods approach, this work assesses the impact of open education and citizen science on youth inclusion, scientific literacy, and community engagement. The inclusion of diverse perspectives and experiences in scientific research can lead to more innovative and effective solutions (Choo, 1996). The expected outcomes include increased participation of youth in scientific research, improved scientific literacy among marginalized populations, and enhanced community engagement with science. This work contributes to a more inclusive and equitable scientific research landscape, where diverse perspectives and experiences are valued and integrated. By promoting open education and citizen science, this work fosters a culture of collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking among youth, and empowers them to address local challenges and contribute to global scientific knowledge. Ultimately, this work informs policy and practice in science education, citizen science, and youth inclusion, and provides a model for inclusive scientific research that can be adapted and scaled up in diverse contexts. The findings of this work will be relevant to educators, researchers, policymakers, and practitioners seeking to promote inclusive and equitable access to scientific research and education.

P.150

Author-Suggested Reviewers Are Less Likely to Recommend Rejection: An Analysis of 39 Physics Journals

Dr. Biz Turnell[1], *Mr. Matthew Barr*[1], *Dr. Melissa Patterson*[1]
[1]*AIP Publishing, Melville, USA*

Objective
Many journals require or allow authors to suggest reviewers upon manuscript submission. This practice can introduce bias if authors suggest individuals who may be more likely to provide a favorable review. The goals of this study were to determine the prevalence and behavior of author-suggested reviewers among journals at a society publisher.

Methods
35,233 initial submissions to 39 AIP Publishing journals from January 2024 through June 2025 were analyzed. Within-manuscript regression analysis was used to compare reviews between author-suggested and other reviewers. Ordinal logistic regression was used to compare the likelihood of manuscript acceptance between manuscripts where all, some, or none of the reviewers were author-suggested.

Results
The overall proportion of invited reviewers who were author-suggested ranged across journals from 7% to 45% (mean [SD]: 22% [10%], n = 401,888 total reviewers), while the proportion of actual reviewers who were author-suggested ranged from 0% to 38% (mean [SD]: 27% [12%], n = 70,219 total reviewers). Surprisingly, author-suggested reviewers were less likely to accept an invitation than were other reviewers (15.0% vs. 19.5%, $p < 0.001$). However, author-suggested reviewers submitted their reviews slightly faster (12.0 vs 12.6 days, $p < 0.001$). Within manuscripts that had at least one author-suggested and one other reviewer, author-suggested reviewers were less likely to recommend rejection than were other reviewers (11.5% vs. 18.4%, $p < 0.001$). Manuscripts with no author-suggested reviewers had a 60.5% chance of ultimately being accepted, those with both author-suggested and other reviewers had a 77.8% chance, and those with author-suggested reviewers had an 88.9% chance ($p < 0.001$).

Conclusions
Author-suggested reviewers are more likely to rate a manuscript favorably, as indicated by the within-manuscript analysis. The use of author-suggested reviewers may increase the chances of a manuscript being accepted. However, this study does not rule out other explanations, such as potential confounding associations between a journal's selectivity and its use of author-suggested reviewers. An experimental manipulation is therefore required to demonstrate this effect.

P.152

Prevalence and Impact of Problematic Articles Referenced in a Dutch Clinical Practice Guidelines Repository

Mr. Ruben Van Diest[1], *Dr. Marcel van der Heyden*[1]
[1]*Department of Medical Physiology, Division Heart & Lungs, University Medical Center, Utrecht, Netherlands*

Objective
Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) provide evidence-based and experience-based recommendations to guide clinical decision-making. However, with rising evidence of scientific integrity issues in both the Netherlands and worldwide, concerns have been raised about the transfer of flawed studies to clinical guidelines. While some studies have identified retracted or otherwise problematic articles referenced in journal-published CPGs, little is known about their prevalence and impact in external guideline repositories commonly used in practice. Therefore, we aim to investigate to what extent Dutch CPGs in an external guideline repository reference problematic research articles and explore their impact on the scientific validity and reliability of the CPGs.

Methods
We have systematically extracted all references from 558 CPGs (PDF format) in the Dutch external guideline repository of the Federatie Medische Specialisten (March 2025). After removing duplicates and references to non-research articles, we used the Crossref application programming interface (API) to retrieve DOIs and excluded entries lacking a valid DOI or PMID. We matched these identifiers with entries in the problematic paper screener (PPS) database to identify referenced problematic research articles.

Results
Preliminary results indicate that, among 73874 unique references, a total of 1853 flagged articles were cited across all CPGs. Of these, ~5% were directly flagged by the “Annulled Detector” (indicating retracted or annulled articles) and appeared in 9% of CPGs, while ~95% were flagged by the “Feet of Clay Detector” (indicating articles that cite one or more annulled studies) and appeared in 55% of CPGs. To explore the impact of annulled articles on the scientific validity and reliability on CPGs, we will analyze the nature of the cited articles, timing of retraction relative to CPG publication or latest revision, reason for annulment and which sections of the CPG were affected.

Conclusions
We show that an external Dutch CPG repository references problematic papers, either directly through annulled articles or potentially indirectly by feet of clay. Further analysis will clarify how these might affect the integrity of CPGs and inform strategies for improving quality assurance in evidence-based medicine.

P.154

Inventory of Knowledge Security Risks within Erasmus MC: An Exploratory Study

Dr Angela van Tilborg[1], *Expert team on Knowledge Security*[1]
[1]*Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, Netherlands*

In an era of increasing geopolitical instability, the protection of sensitive knowledge—particularly with potential dual-use applications—has become a critical concern for academic and healthcare institutions. This exploratory study investigates knowledge security risks within Erasmus MC, with the aim of raising awareness and strengthening internal risk management strategies.

Using a mixed-methods approach that included stakeholder interviews, document analysis, and structured risk assessments, we identified vulnerabilities across several domains: human resource management, collaboration with external partners, compartmentalization practices, risk awareness, and digital infrastructure. These areas represent key touchpoints where sensitive knowledge may be exposed or inadequately protected.

Although various protective measures are currently in place, our findings reveal persistent gaps in policy, organizational awareness, and technical safeguards. This study offers actionable recommendations to enhance knowledge security and supports the development of a comprehensive framework for risk mitigation—contributing to the broader goal of safeguarding research integrity within academic medical centers.

P.156

How Updating the UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity Brought Clarity and Sparked Discussion Across the UK Research System

Mrs. Rebecca Mrs. Veitch[1], ***Dr Anne Taylor***[2]
[1]*UK Research and Innovation, United Kingdom,* [2]*Wellcome, United Kingdom*

Since 2012, the UK has used the Concordat to Support Research Integrity ('the Concordat') as a national framework setting expectations around practice for those conducting research, governing it, and funding it. The Concordat originally set out four principles for working in the research system and encouraged adherence to these through a set of responsibilities aimed at researchers, employers and funders. In 2019 the Concordat was updated to reflect changes to the system and opportunities raised by the UK's House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee, adding a fifth principle: accountability.

In 2024 the Concordat signatories began a process for refreshing the Concordat. This presentation will guide participants through that process and describe how the Concordat changed. The focus of the refresh was to i) ensure it remained relevant in changing times and supported continual improvement; and ii) increase accessibility of the framework and reduce repetition so members of the research community could more easily engage with it. People working across the UK system were invited to participate in consultation opportunities on the Concordat refresh in 2024, providing key input on how and where strengthening the wording in the Concordat would help improve practice.

Following a discussion of the process, this presentation will:

- explore how the Concordat responsibilities support behaviour that leads to trustworthy research practice and outputs
- highlight the Concordat's connection to other frameworks as part of efforts to build upon and support good practice worldwide
- consider how responsibilities within the UK system can support global expectations.

The presenters will finish by sharing insights into areas that were not in scope for the refresh project but have been the focus since. This includes updating the template used by research organisations to write annual statements on research integrity and the governance of the Concordat itself.

P.158

Empowering Researchers with Effective Language for Patient Consent to Foster Health Data Sharing

*Ms. Jessica Edmonds[1], **Dr. Anna Catharina Vieira Armond**[1], Mr. Marc Albert[1], Dr. Patrick Bermudez[1], Mr. Alexander Bernier[1], Dr. Bartha Maria Knoppers[1], Mr. Dylan Roskams-Edris[1], Ms. Anita David[1], Ms. Hanna Jones-Eriksson[1], Mr. Christopher Fink[1], Ms. Kimberly Mitchell[1], Prof David Moher[1], Ms. Janina Ramos[1], Dr. Dawn Richards[1], Mr. Adrian Thorgood[1], Mr. Murray Walz[1], Dr. Jodi Edwards[1], Dr Kelly Cobey[1]*
[1]The University of Ottawa Heart Institute (UOHI), Ottawa, Canada

Background
Open science promotes transparency, reproducibility, collaboration, and innovation. Yet most health research data are not shared beyond teams, even where policies encourage sharing. With privacy safeguards, most participants are willing to share data. Our team from the Metaresearch and Open Science Program at the University of Ottawa Heart Institute (UOHI) identified a gap in consent templates and developed harmonized language for open and controlled data sharing.

Methods
We drafted consent template language for open and controlled data sharing, prospectively and retrospectively, then obtained legal and bioethics consultation. After revisions, we held focus groups with research ethics board members, privacy experts, patients, and caregivers. Feedback informed final revisions, followed by a concluding legal review.

Results
Focus group feedback enhanced clarity, readability, and structure of consent templates. The first session involved 49 research ethics board members and privacy experts recruited via the Canadian Association of Research Ethics Boards (CAREB-ACCER) and the Secretariat for Responsible Conduct of Research. The second session included 10 patients and caregivers recruited through Clinical Trials Ontario (CTO) and Clinical Trials British Columbia (CT-BC). Participants in both groups recommended improving wording on data use and recontacting in retrospective consent forms, expanding the risks and benefits section, reducing template length, and simplifying language for comprehension. Feedback was thematically analyzed, tabulated, and shared with the legal team to confirm accuracy and ensure all exemplar quotes were appropriately reflected. Based on this analysis, the templates were revised and completed a final legal review to ensure alignment with ethical and legal standards for data sharing and participant protection.

Conclusions
The finalized data sharing consent templates are publicly available through Data Governance & Ethics – ARCHIMEDES. This standardized pan-Canadian approach supports open science by promoting coordinated data deposit and sharing while ensuring participants provide free and informed consent consistent with privacy, ethics, and research data management best practices.

P.160

From Ethical Guidelines to REC Practice: Promoting Research Integrity in Forced Migration Research in Germany

Prof. Hella von Unger[1], *Dr. Eva Maria Berens*[2], *Ms Tanja Gangarova*[3], *Dr. des. Anna Huber*[1], *Ms Nevien Kerk*[1], *Prof. Ulrike Krause*[4], *Ms Maryam Mohammadi*[5], *Dr. Herwig Reiter*[6], *Dr. Olaf Tietje*[1]
[1]*LMU Munich, Munich, Germany,* [2]*University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany,* [3]*German Center for Integration and MIgration Research (DeZIM), Berlin, Germany,* [4]*University of Muenster, Muenster, Germany,* [5]*State Association for Health and Academy of Social Medicine Lower Saxony (LVG & AfS e.V.), Hannover, Germany,* [6]*German Youth Institute (DJI), Munich, Germany*

Forced migration research poses specific ethical challenges that go beyond the scope of general research ethics guidelines. To address these, dedicated frameworks have been developed both internationally and in Germany. Yet, their systematic use in Research Ethics Committees (RECs) remains limited. Bridging this gap is crucial to enable ethics review to adequately address the realities of this field. To advance such translation, the German Network of Research Ethics Committees in the Social Sciences (neks) convened an event in July 2025 in Munich with around 50 researchers and REC members. This contribution presents key insights and practical implications from the discussion, aiming to support both researchers and RECs in assessing the ethical dimensions of social science research in contexts of displacement.

Four considerations proved particularly salient. First, power asymmetries, human suffering, and situations of precarity require heightened ethical sensitivity, while at the same time recognising refugees' diversity, survival strategies, and agency. Second, researchers and RECs must critically examine the use of "vulnerability" as a label and safeguard participants' self-determination. Third, research in this field can generate specific strains and risks for researchers themselves, especially during fieldwork in unsafe contexts. Fourth, postcolonial legacies shape knowledge production and call for avoiding structural and epistemic injustice, for instance through unintended othering or insufficient partnerships with refugee communities.

While existing guidelines provide orientation, many ethical challenges arise during or after fieldwork, beyond the scope of ex ante review. Research ethics and integrity therefore requires ongoing reflexivity and peer support, not only formal REC approval. Rather than relying on standardised protocols, REC processes should encourage critical reflection and sustained dialogue, enabling researchers to respond responsibly to dilemmas as they emerge.

P.162

Global Leadership in Research Integrity Education: Epigeum's Collaborative and Contextualised Approach

Ms. Naomi Wilkinson[1]
[1]*Sage Publishing, London, United Kingdom*

Objective
This presentation will explore how Epigeum collaborates with higher education institutions worldwide to deliver research integrity education, continually adapting to evolving local and global standards, funder requirements, and institutional needs to provide relevant, impactful, and context-specific training that supports the promotion of research integrity.

Methods for Collaborative Development
Our Research Integrity programs are authored by Nicholas Steneck and regional expert contributors, and in collaboration with expert panels from our partner institutions in each region. This enables us to deliver a consistent core of training that is contextualised to meet regional requirements, while facilitating continuous feedback and updates for ongoing program improvement.

Results- Reach and Impact
Epigeum's Research Integrity programs have been used in 83 institutions, across 26 countries.

Monitoring engagement and efficacy is essential to ensure that programs align with both user and institutional objectives. We will present the latest user data, including results from platform user surveys conducted over the past 12 months. The findings indicate an average course quality rating of 4.15 out of 5, and an average score of 4.13 out of 5 for enhancing understanding.

We will also present feedback and case studies from partner universities including perspectives on mandated versus recommended training, how universities align training with institutional policies, and the benefits of the programs to researchers.

And finally we will describe how our Development Group workshops and feedback loops help to refine content in light of legislation and funder requirements, as well as addressing emerging issues, such as the use of AI, in order to help universities effectively meet their compliance needs.

Conclusion
Maintaining continuous feedback loops with universities is essential to ensure that training remains relevant, engaging and cost-effective for our university partners around the world. A sustained focus on efficacy, engagement and culture change will be a key part of future development and improvement efforts, underscoring the significance of effective support for implementation and reporting. These will be supported by ongoing enhancements to user experience (UX) and accessibility.

P.164

Using Plagiarism Detection Software To Find Potential Hallucinated References

Dr. Nick Wise[1]
[1]*Taylor & Francis, United Kingdom*

Generative AI tools are used by many researchers to assist in the preparation and writing of research papers[1]. However, when generative AI tools are used to suggest references, the way many tools operate means they suggest works that are likely to exist, not that do exist, so-called 'hallucinated' references[2]. Hallucinated references may be fake titles ascribed to real researchers in a field, or real titles ascribed to the wrong journal, for example. If the researcher does not attempt to verify the reference provided by the AI tool, these non-existent references can be included in submissions, which may be published[3]. Hallucinated references cannot substantiate a claim in a paper, pollute the scientific literature, and require corrective publisher action in accordance with editorial policies.

Efficient methods are required to detect hallucinated references in submissions, to avoid the need to manually check every reference. Plagiarism detection software, for example Turnitin, is used routinely by many publishers to detect the reuse of text in submissions. The software highlights text that has previously appeared elsewhere, which may indicate a problem requiring investigation.

However, for the references section, the reverse is true. Most references will have been referenced previously, or appear in databases such as PubMed, and therefore the whole reference will be highlighted. If a reference is unhighlighted, it provides a signal that the work may not exist because it has been hallucinated. If a reference is partially highlighted, or highlighted in different colours, that indicates that parts of the reference are associated with multiple works and could be hallucinated. Using plagiarism detection software in this manner provides a way to screen bibliographies for potential hallucinated references and prompt further investigation.

1. Evanko, D. S. & Di Natale, M., Quantifying and Assessing the Use of Generative AI by Authors and Reviewers in the Cancer Research Field, 2025, https://peerreviewcongress.org/abstract/quantifying-and-assessing-the-use-of-generative-ai-by-authors-and-reviewers-in-the-cancer-research-field/

2. Chelli, M et al, Hallucination Rates and Reference Accuracy of ChatGPT and Bard for Systematic Reviews: Comparative Analysis, 2024, Journal of Medical Internet Research

3. https://retractionwatch.com/2025/06/30/springer-nature-book-on-machine-learning-is-full-of-made-up-citations/